

Congressional Record.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS FOURTH SESSION.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, December 29, 1922.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 27, 1922.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Ernst	Lenroot	Phipps
Bayard	Fernald	Lodge	Poinexter
Borah	Fletcher	McCormick	Pomerene
Brandegee	Gerry	McCumber	Reed, Mo.
Brookhart	Hale	McKellar	Sheppard
Broussard	Harris	McKinley	Shortridge
Bursum	Hedlin	McLean	Smoot
Calder	Hitchcock	McNary	Spencer
Cameron	Johnson	Moses	Stanfield
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Sterling
Caraway	Jones, Wash.	New	Sutherland
Colt	Kellogg	Nicholson	Townsend
Culberson	Kendrick	Norbeck	Trammell
Cummins	Keyes	Norris	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	King	Oddie	Warren
Dial	Ladd	Page	Watson
Dillingham	La Follette	Pepper	Weller

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily detained because of illness in his family.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PEPPER presented a memorial of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Board of Trade, remonstrating against the passage of the bill (H. R. 12237) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. KENDRICK presented the petition of John D. Phillips and sundry other members of the Parent-Teachers' Association of Upton, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Casper (Wyo.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the adoption of the Budget recommendation to appropriate only \$3,000,000 for carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal highway act pertaining to forest roads and trails, and urging the appropriation of \$6,500,000 as authorized by law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

FOODSTUFFS AND RAW MATERIALS FOR GERMANY.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide credit to Germany for the purpose of purchasing foodstuffs and raw materials in this country. It is evident that the serious problem with our farmers to-day is to market at living prices their surplus products. I am in hopes that this bill will be found to be drawn along serviceable and sound lines. I ask its reference to the Finance Committee.

The bill (S. 4243) to stimulate trade by providing credit to enable Germany to purchase foodstuffs and raw materials in the United States, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 4244) for the relief of the Ogden Chamber of Commerce; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 4245) to provide the necessary organization of the customs service for an adequate administration and enforce-

ment of the tariff act of 1922, and all other customs revenue laws; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KELLOGG:

A bill (S. 4246) granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Paul, Minn., and the county of Ramsey, Minn., or either of them, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the point where Robert Street, in said city of St. Paul, crosses the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LENROOT:

A bill (S. 4247) granting a pension to Mertie M. Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 4248) to fix the compensation of employees in post offices for overtime services performed in excess of eight hours daily; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

AMENDMENTS TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PHIPPS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13559, the Interior Department appropriation bill, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 99, line 13, strike out "\$35,000, including" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$73,000, including not exceeding \$38,000 for completing the widening of the Nisqually Glacier to Paradise Valley Road."

On page 99, line 17, strike out "\$95,000" and insert "\$133,000."

On page 100, line 6, strike out "\$11,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$61,000." Also on page 100, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "in all, \$74,280" and insert the words "including not exceeding \$50,000 for construction and improvement of roads; in all, \$124,280."

On page 101, line 25, strike out "\$70,000" and insert "\$120,000," and on page 102, line 3, strike out "in all, \$295,000" and insert "including not exceeding \$50,000 for construction and improvement of roads; in all, \$345,000."

CLAIM OF CHARLES PARIDY ET AL.

Mr. McKINLEY (by request) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 387), which was referred to the Committee on Claims:

Whereas the Government, through its Department of War, during the late war with Germany purchased and used several thousand caterpillar war tanks and tractors; and

Whereas the war tanks and tractors named in the preceding paragraph have been charged to be an infringement upon Charles Paridy's United States Letters Patent No. 1047281 in a suit against the Government, filed October 27, 1920 (and still pending), in the Court of Claims, and entitled as follows:

Charles Paridy, Anna McLatchie, and Ferdinand Lother, claimants, v. the United States. No. 34716.

In which suit the patentee, Charles Paridy, together with his assignees of part interest, Anna McLatchie and Ferdinand Lother, claims damages in the sum of \$10,000,000 for the use of said patented war tanks and tractors by the Government; and

Whereas the patentee's original petition in said Court of Claims suit contains sworn statements that, according to the reports of the Director of Finance and Auditor of the War Department, there was at the time of filing said suit (October 27, 1920) in the hands of the Treasurer of the United States the sum of \$100,000,000 with which to pay the cost of said patented war tanks and tractors; and

Whereas not a single cent has yet been paid to said patentee, Charles Paridy, or to his said assignees in part, Anna McLatchie and Ferdinand Lother, by the Government as license fees, royalties, or as damages for the use of said war tanks and tractors, notwithstanding the fact, as shown by said suit now pending in the Court of Claims, that the said patentee and his assignees in part filed said suit and therein claimed \$10,000,000 in damages over two years ago; and

Whereas the said claimants, Charles Paridy, Anna McLatchie, and Ferdinand Lother, have agreed, and do hereby agree, to reduce the amount of their claim 50 per cent, from \$10,000,000 to \$5,000,000, upon the passage of this resolution and the immediate payment to them of said reduced amount by order of the War Department out of money that has already been appropriated and now being held subject to the orders of the War Department, ready to be disbursed, in payment for war supplies, but with the proviso that in case there is not sufficient money thus available to forthwith pay said claimants the said sum of \$5,000,000, then claimants' offer to reduce their claim 50 per cent, as above recited, may be forthwith withdrawn and claimants will be at liberty to prosecute the said suit in the Court of Claims for the full amount of their claim, to wit, \$10,000,000; and said suit shall be given precedence over all other suits filed subsequently and shall be speedily prepared for trial and be tried and decided at the earliest possible date on account of its long pendency before the Court of Claims: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Director of Finance and Auditor of the War Department be, and hereby is, requested to settle the claim now pending in the Court of Claims, suit No. 34716, as above recited, for the

sum of \$5,000,000, and to pay said sum to the claimants, Charles Paridy, Anna McLatchie, and Ferdinand Lother, forthwith out of War Department funds already appropriated; and upon such payment the said claimants' said suit shall be forthwith dismissed and no further claim shall thereafter be made against the United States for any infringement of the said Paridy Letters Patent No. 1047281 by any owner of any interest therein: *Provided*, That if sufficient money to pay said amount is not already appropriated, and the amount can not be paid out of funds now subject to the orders of the War Department, then the said claimants may prosecute their said pending suit in the Court of Claims for the full amount of \$10,000,000 against the United States, the same as if the said offer of settlement at 50 per cent reduction had not been made, and said suit shall be speedily prepared for trial and be tried and decided at the earliest possible date on account of its long pendency before said court.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PROPERTY REPORT OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS (S. DOC. NO. 279).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, transmitting pursuant to law a complete account of all property in his possession and in the Senate Office Building belonging to the United States Senate on December 4, 1922, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, out of the long contest over the foreign policy of our Government there developed three distinct viewpoints evidenced by groups in this Chamber and by the larger groups without. There were those who believed that from the Great War had come an obligation for the United States to become substantially a part of a world concert under definite rules and agreements, such as were prescribed in the covenant of the League of Nations. This group would have unhesitatingly taken us into the league without amendment of its provisions and would gladly had us unite with other nations under its terms without modification or alteration.

A second group, while believing our ultimate purpose should be that proclaimed by the first, insisted that prudence dictated our future be protected by reservations or amendments from the possibilities of some of the conditions of the league.

And yet a third group, while wishing that our country should be both generous and unselfish in dealing with other nations, believed that the high purpose of the Republic could be fulfilled and its ultimate destiny realized only by continuing its age-old policies, under which the Nation has grown great and powerful, rich and happy.

The divergent views were finally carried directly to the people, and whatever may be said by those who had desired us to become a part of the international compact, the fact remains that we did not enter the league and that our people overwhelmingly repudiated it.

The contest did not stop, however, with 1920, nor with the final action in this Chamber. The propaganda has been continuous and increasing to drive this country into some sort of international pact, to discredit the action of the Senate in refusing to enter the league, and every art of subtle publicity has been utilized in the effort to reverse the decision of the American people and to destroy those who officially have been a part of that decision.

I am against the Borah amendment. I am against it for precisely the reasons I was against taking the United States into the League of Nations. I am against it because, in my opinion, it will do exactly what thus far we have declined to do. I am against it because in even greater degree, and with less safeguards than the League of Nations gave to us, it will embroil us in European controversies and finally make the United States, after a hundred and fifty years, a part of the European system. I am against the amendment as it is presented, and, just as in the former contest, of which it is, in my judgment, but a continuation, I am against it with either reservations or amendments. I have been unable to conceive any amendment or reservation which, leaving the design, would avert the possible injurious consequences.

During the war we were fascinated by phrases. The wizardry of words still holds some of our people enthralled. The facile pen or eloquent tongue can paint the picture of the suffering and the woe and the anguish of the world, and in burning sen-

tences demand that in some nebulous, uncertain, and undisclosed fashion we should at all hazards rescue our brethren at the uttermost ends of the earth from their trials, their tribulations, and their sufferings. The idealistic appeal strikes an answering and sympathetic chord in every human breast. The hope and the aspiration of aiding humanity were not born in many of us merely with the war and can never be forgotten, even though we decline to pursue a much-heralded but demonstrated fallacy presented by those who arrogate to themselves all the world's idealism and sympathy. This hope and this aspiration are not attributes alone of a few superior beings, who demand, upon pain of their denial of altruism and idealism to the rest of us, that we follow any course they may mark. We decline to enter into Europe's maelstrom without definite and cogent reasons upon the mere arrogation of a superior charity, benevolence, and altruism by those who would take us in, or because of denunciation of those who will not blindly accept and follow any suggested course. I do not ascribe this attitude to any man in this Chamber. It is, however, the distinct attitude of many of the advocates of this amendment without this Chamber.

Just what is it that is asked by the amendment? It provides for a conference—

which shall be charged with the duty of considering the economic problems now obtaining throughout the world with a view of arriving at such understandings or arrangements as may seem essential to the restoration of trade and to the establishment of sound financial and business conditions.

I am dealing now only with the first part of the amendment. On some future occasion I intend to refer to the latter part. Obviously, the amendment provides for the consideration of every world economic problem. Not only does it provide for the consideration of every world economic problem but it distinctly directs that "understandings and arrangements" shall be arrived at. Understandings and arrangements by whom? The United States calls the conference. It sits with those who attend. Of necessity, in conjunction with those invited, it must arrive at understandings and arrangements affecting every world problem. It would be unspeakable to call this conference, and when called, to stand aside and refuse to have aught to do with it. It would be worse to call this conference and arrive at understandings and arrangements, and then refuse to do our part and let those understandings and arrangements be carried out by others. If we meet with the other nations of the earth to consider their world problems, calling upon them with us to reach the solution, and a solution be reached, we must bear our part subsequently in carrying out that solution. We must do our share in executing the understandings and agreements arrived at. In good faith, there can be no escape from this conclusion.

What problems are to be considered by this conference? The language of the amendment includes all, and I am well within the fact when I say that the economic problems of the world are inextricably commingled to-day with its political problems. It is an utter and absolute impossibility to arrive at a definite solution of the economic problems of the world without solving at the same time some of its political ills. Let us make no mistake, therefore, about what this amendment means according to its terms. It means that every ill from which Europe now is suffering, every problem there existing, every dismal situation, every wrong and injustice shall be brought to the city of Washington at our request, at our instance, and upon our invitation, for solution, and that we undertake thereafter, because we are the leaders in the movement, whatever is essential to rewrite Europe's present story. If the language of the amendment does not mean exactly this thing, it can mean nothing at all. I have not heard its advocates here and I have not read its newspaper advocates outside this Chamber designate what they expect to be accomplished by the conference nor indicate the specific economic subjects with which it will deal.

Mr. President, I prefer a League of Nations with some rules of procedure, with the members bound by some preliminary agreement, to this general omnibus endeavor which has neither limitations nor specifications.

As I understand the argument here, two reasons are advanced for the adoption of the amendment and for our immediate participation in the difficulties of Europe. The first, and apparently that most vigorously insisted upon, is that we are already in Europe; that because we have some troops on the Rhine and some observers or representatives at the various conferences being held abroad we are at present actually in Europe, and, therefore, we but continue what already is an accomplished fact.

That we are thus now in Europe is deplored. Indeed, apparently in both the instances cited, it is earnestly and em-

phatically asserted we ought not to be there. Demand is made for the return of the American soldiers, and that those representing America at the European conferences cease their activities. I quarrel with neither demand. But the logic of the position assumed seems to be that inasmuch as we commit a little wrong, we will cure it by a greater. The vice of the argument is not only in its illogic but in its erroneous assumption. The United States is not officially in Europe. Those there do not and can not bind this country either morally or legally to any particular course.

I have no apologies to make for the maintenance of our troops upon the Rhine. I care not whether France wishes them or Germany begs them to remain. They should be brought home. I know little of what Mr. Boyden does at meetings of the Reparation Commission. I do know he can not bind the United States, and I doubt very much if he projects this country into activities that are none of our concern. Be that as it may, however, is it intended, because these things exist, actually now to make us a part of the Reparation Commission? I can not otherwise see the conclusion of what is here suggested than that we, the United States, must become a part of the Reparation Commission, and as a part of this, the most important and most repulsive element of the Versailles treaty, enforce its terms either as written, or to be modified in some undisclosed fashion by conference.

What is it that retards Germany's recovery and incidentally the recovery of Europe? In answer I need not quote the world's statesmen nor even the Senator from Idaho. In a word, all understand now that it is the Versailles treaty, and in particular the reparations provisions. What then, even were we to embark upon a new foreign policy and engage with Europe, in agreements to solve Europe's ills, and execute the agreements reached, must we first deal with? Obviously, the reparations clauses of the Versailles treaty. I reecho what has been said in the last few days about our position at the making of the treaty, when America was the only nation asking and receiving neither lands nor reparations, and Americans for all time can take a just pride in our country's attitude. I do not hesitate to extend to President Wilson the fullest praise for his stand at Paris in this respect. But those who have studied the Versailles treaty, all the liberal statesmen of the world, now regret it, and especially deplore the provisions relating to reparations.

I speak of the reparations provisions so emphatically because, in the final analysis, they constitute one of the two things with which an economic conference, if real and of aid, must deal. I take it there is not a man in the United States who desires that an economic conference be called in this country or elsewhere without having that conference a real one and having it deal with the very subject matters which to-day are the cause of the conditions prevailing in Europe. So I say—and none, I think will question the accuracy of the statement—that if a conference be held which is intended to be real that conference must deal first with the reparations question and the provisions of the Versailles treaty relating to reparations.

Mr. President, to speak of aiding Europe without taking into account the treaty and these clauses is to indulge in the veriest moonshine. Remember what the Reparation Commission is. It is in essence a government possessing the attributes of sovereignty with power to issue decrees, which the German Government must put in legislative form, with quasi, if not complete, judicial power, and certainly executive power. It is a foreign body issuing its mandates from unfriendly soil. It might even require and utilize troops to enforce its decrees. It is a secret supergovernment, utterly repugnant to American conceptions and ideas. This is the brief description by an eminent authority, the Senator from Idaho. No exhortation of the Reparation Commission has equaled that of the distinguished Senator. His denunciation strikes a sympathetic chord; and as we realize exactly what the commission is, and what its powers portend, we of the Congress resolve that our country shall have no part in its activities or iniquities. But it is precisely there we are headed by the Borah amendment.

It may be said by our internationalists that we can have an economic conference, rehabilitate Europe, and have nothing to do with reparations or the Reparation Commission. What incredible egotism is this! France is to receive 52 per cent, as I recall, of the reparations to be paid. Are there any so credulous as to believe that upon the altruistic suggestion that reparations be waived or the terms of the treaty modified France will gracefully assent? We are simple in diplomacy and childlike in our faith, but none so simple or credulous as to believe that France will forego what she deems her rights without adequate guaranties. Are you ready to give these guaranties? I am not. Admittedly, reparations constitute the key

to economic stability and recovery of the Central Powers. Whether their terms continue as they are or are modified, provision for their execution must be made; and if France yields to any entreaty of ours for modification, justly France may insist either that we underwrite the new terms or guarantee them, or that we become one of the members charged with their execution. Do you desire to underwrite reparations to France or any country? I do not. Let some statesman here, fired with a world resolve, tell how an economic conference can be held without one of its principal subjects being the reparation terms of the Versailles treaty. And if it be admitted this troublesome and wicked thing must be disposed of at once, you are in the realm not only of an economic conference but a most important political conference. And if because of this fact you eliminate the reparations question from your conference, you better not hold one, for at the end you will be as at the beginning, and the festering sore of Europe will be more virulent.

Just one other thing may be done to aid Europe, and this possibly in some minds is the nub of the whole matter. We might minister to Europe's needs and assist in her restoration by lending her more money. If any man in Congress dared suggest that our Government make additional loans to European Governments, the American people would quickly end his political activities. We will not, and we ought not, make any other loans to European Governments. I suspect certain gentlemen engaged in international banking hug the delusion that our Government may underwrite loans they may make; but I suggest to them that their hopes are but an iridescent dream.

Following to its logical conclusion the proposal for this conference we must choose either the alternative of arousing false hopes and doing incalculable harm or of entering upon a course far removed from what is merely financial and which may jeopardize our future, and which, if once entered upon, may make us a part of Europe's future political controversies.

The second reason advanced for this conference, broadly stated, is that if we do not intervene economically in Europe we will have to intervene in war there. I deny it. If we intervene economically—whatever that may mean—we will be in the midst of Europe's turmoil and may possibly be involved in Europe's wars. But to say that without this conference, with all that may flow from it, we will be involved in some future European war, is, I think, a bit extravagant. It will be a long, long day before European troubles will entice us to war, and I think we may dismiss the threat of war from this discussion.

The bait is held before our farmers that they will prosper if we will but confer on Europe's reconstruction; but the farmers have not been told the only reconstruction suggested involves us for generations in Europe's controversies. Aid the farmer? Not so. Aid the international banker? Yes; and the farmer will pay the price.

A great deal has been said of the distress and financial chaos of Europe. Much of it is true. Conditions in a part of Europe, however, do not sustain the doleful tale. The statistics of imports and exports of Great Britain do not indicate that Great Britain is perishing. Here are the figures:

In 1913 the monthly average imports of Great Britain were £84,000,000. In 1922 the monthly average imports up to and including September, which is the last month of record, were £80,000,000.

As to exports, the monthly average in 1913 was £44,000,000. In 1922 the monthly average up to and including September, which is the last month of record, was £59,000,000.

How about the foreign exchange of Great Britain—the pound sterling?

In September, 1920, it was 72 per cent of par in relation to the dollar; in September, 1921, it was 77 per cent of par in relation to the dollar; in September, 1922, it was 91 per cent of par in relation to the dollar.

Other countries of Europe, not war torn, present similar situations.

Take the Netherlands: The value of the guilder in percentage of par in September, 1920, was 73 per cent; in September, 1922, 97 per cent.

Take Sweden: The value of the krone in percentage of par in September, 1920, was 75 per cent; in September, 1922, it was 99 per cent.

Take Switzerland: The value of the Swiss franc in percentage of par in September, 1920, was 84 per cent; in September, 1922, it was 97 per cent.

Thus a part of Europe, at least, is recovering financial stability, and in the peoples may be found some of the moral of the present situation.

The trouble, of course, in central Europe is just as related by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick] yesterday. The

trouble is red, is awful war—war that has left its impress that a generation and generations of generations can scarcely wipe out—war, war, awful war and destruction. Not only that, but as well the collapse of Russia contributes to the distressful conditions there; and, remember, our country will have nothing to do with Russia, and presumably Russia would not be a part of an economic conference. Lest you misunderstand me, I want you to know that I do not believe in that policy at all; but as far as officially we are concerned, Russia would be no part of an economic conference, for we have naught to do with that government. Russia, with its collapse; red war, with all that it means; and beyond that there are other reasons for conditions over there, reasons that will be found in the intimacies of the chancelleries and the ministries of Europe, too; reasons that we want to be no part of in the days to come, just as we have been no part of them in the days gone by.

Oh, Mr. President, what magic there is in the word "conference"! What talismanic characteristics it has that it makes every puzzle-headed man outside this Chamber in ecstasy at once say "A conference; oh, a conference!" All the world yields to the magic of the word. Oh, how great it is! A conference will wipe out all the devastation of war. Every ill that man is heir to will cease if we just have a conference; and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] yesterday, in beginning his exquisite little address, used a homely illustration and a very apt illustration. Conference appeals to him. Conference, of course, appeals to me, and I heard his illustration sympathetically, and I recall that he said that if two men outside are having differences, and they come and put their feet under the same table in a conference, their differences likely will be composed and all will be well.

Let us draw the analogy a little closer. Let us make it a bit more apt to what we are facing to-day.

A creditor walks down the street—a great, robust, powerful creditor. He meets a half-dozen debtors, squabbling among themselves, all in distress. He meets these half-dozen debtors, all suffering financial distress and wondering what the outcome will be, and says: "What is the matter, my friends?" They say: "We are troubled, we are financially depressed. We do not know what to do." "Ah," he says, "I have the remedy. Come to my house to-day at 2 p. m. to the moment. We will hold a conference and all your ills forthwith will be cured."

The creditor returns to his home. The six debtors come. Around the table they sit. They hold a conference; and as the creditor beams upon his debtors he says, "Now we will forever arrange every ill that is yours. We will now, all of us sitting around this table in a conference, provide every remedy that may be necessary for your future."

Then one of the debtors modestly pipes up and says: "Fine! Fine! Thank you, Mr. Creditor; thank you! Let us consider first the debts that we owe you." Then the creditor, with an austere demeanor, sternly says: "Not so! Not so! I can not permit you to discuss the debts that you owe me. That is something that I could not for an instant tolerate. We will confer upon other matters and upon the debts you owe one another." Thus he forecloses inquiry on the subject that is most important to his debtors; but he brings to them hope again, for he says: "Here we sit in conference around the table. Our legs are under the same mahogany, and in conference now all your ills shall be solved. Let us take up your debts to one another. You who owe a debt to the other sitting next to you need pay just so much, and you who are the creditor of this individual will receive only so much."

"Well," says the individual affected, "That might be all right if you will guarantee the payment."

"Oh, no; no; no"; says the creditor, "I am not guaranteeing anything here. I am holding a conference. I am not dealing with anything else; I am holding a conference, and I will not guarantee anything that shall be paid to you."

"Then underwrite, will you not," says the poor debtor in despair.

"Underwrite? Not a bit of it. My people would not tolerate for a single instant that I underwrite it."

"Then, for heaven's sake, if you reduce, guarantee the execution of the payment of the reduced amount."

"No," is the firm response, "we will not touch that. We will take up other matters. We will hold our conference and cure your ills, but not in that fashion."

Then another one pipes up, who doubtless had read the speeches made on the other side of the Chamber, and he says, "You deny us markets by your tariff bill. Destroy your tariff wall, repeal your tariff law, and you will cure us of our economic ills."

"No; you can not talk to me about that," says the creditor. "That is my own domestic concern, which I will submit to no man's arbitration, to the arbitrament of no set of men."

Then another says, "Oh, let down your immigration bars. Perhaps with some of our people leaving our country you may aid us a bit."

"Immigration bars? Who are you to say to me that immigration shall be as you desire? We determine that. Pass to another matter and let this conference be a success."

So it goes down the line with every question of import and every one of concern; and finally the conference is adjourned with the benediction and the blessing of the great creditor who called it, with the imprecations and the maledictions of every other man who attended it; and after it is all over up comes a bewhiskered gentleman scratching his head and saying, "I am a farmer. What have I gotten out of this thing?" The creditor turns upon him with severity and indignation and says, "Oh, you ungrateful wretch; you have got your conference."

And the conference has been held. The illustration of the Senator from Oregon may be carried to that sort of conclusion. Magic in conferences? How many have been held in Europe in the last year or so? Conferences have been held in all the various cities of Europe, held by those primarily concerned over there, held by those most interested in determining the reconstruction of Europe. They have been holding their conferences; and what a fatuous folly it seems for us over here to say, "What you can not do yourselves and will not do, we will do without mixing in with you at all."

Silly nonsense, is this? It is perhaps an unfortunate trait of American character which Dickens used aptly to describe, a trait of American character that sees naught else than its own creature and its own self, a trait of American character we could not impute to anyone in the Senate and which, with our experience, could never be ours.

Conferences? Conferences upon what? Economic conferences? Oh, ecstatic is the thought! Economic conferences; and yet no man has told us, no paper in its denunciation has yet unfolded, what an economic conference may be or where finally it may lead. Is there no lesson in the last few years to us? Is there nothing we have learned in the last few months from the situation in the Near East? Conferences? Remember, my Democratic brethren, the League of Nations lives—I will not say, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick] said yesterday, that it languishes—but the League of Nations lives to-day, a world entity. The League of Nations lives; yet within a brief period the two most powerful members of that league—the leaders, presumably, of civilization, at least beyond the water—the two most powerful members of that league each backed a belligerent and an antagonist in the Near East and fomented a bloody war there which finally required the troops of one in an endeavor to stop the havoc which had been the fault of both those members of the league and, so far as I am aware, sir, without the league even taking cognizance of the war. The two most powerful nations in Europe, the two most influential members of the League, conferring every month—at Genoa, at Cannes, at Geneva, at Lausanne, and at every other city in Europe—the two most powerful member nations of the league fomented a bloody war, a bloody war for which they, and they alone, were responsible.

I want no part for this great Nation of ours in that kind of adventure. I want no part for the United States of America in that kind of conference, and the conclusions and understandings arrived at in that kind of conference. Because I do not, sir, I am standing here with what vigor I possess, without the eloquence of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, without his power of invective or expression, standing here, though, with every fiber of mine fighting, just as I have fought since 1917, fighting, fighting, fighting, to keep America from these mad adventures of Europe, and against jeopardizing the future of the Republic we all love.

Mr. President, the arguments which have been made upon this floor we have heard before. This is not the first time that every argument presented here has been made to us; not the first time; nor have the arguments in the past been any less eloquent than those which have been recently made here. It but adds to the fame and the glory of both that the arguments made in behalf of the League of Nations by Woodrow Wilson are substantially the same as the arguments made by the Senator from Idaho in behalf of this amendment.

In the last couple of days I have read again the speeches of Mr. Wilson in his celebrated pilgrimage throughout the country. I read them not only with interest but with profit. All of you may read them with profit; profit to yourselves, and perhaps profit to your country. I do not wish to occupy the time to-day in reading the passages, but I have marked the places in those speeches where Mr. Wilson, arguing for the League of Nations, said, in substantially the same words which have been heard upon this floor, "We must become partners with the rest

of the world, or economic chaos will be ours, and possibly war may come to us." His words respecting the treaty of Versailles are very, very instructive. Names and epithets may be applied to those who differed with him then; epithets and names may be applied to those who differ now with the Senator from Idaho, but read Mr. Wilson's praises of the treaty, read his remarks concerning the reparations provisions of the treaty. He describes the treaty as a just and an American instrument. He describes it in terms extravagantly of praise. Who is there to-day in all the world, among the statesmen of all the earth, who would reecho now the sentiments expressed by Mr. Wilson regarding the treaty of Versailles? When he speaks of the reparations—and I speak by the book now, for before me it is—when he speaks of the reparations he says, "The terms are severe, but are just," and he praises the constitution of the Reparation Commission and what it may in the future do. Who is there in all the earth to-day who praises the Reparation Commission or the provisions of the Versailles treaty relating to reparations?

Oh, my friends on the other side of the Chamber, you were wrong about the Versailles treaty. Oh, my friends on the other side of the Chamber, your spokesman was wrong about the Reparation Commission and the terms of the treaty relating to reparations.

Oh, ye upon this side of the Chamber, if your views be like those of the Senator from Oregon and you think we should ratify the treaty of Versailles, remember that there is not a responsible statesman in all the world to-day but deploras the treaty, but regrets certain of its terms, and the great thing some are endeavoring to do for Europe economically is to rewrite a part of the provisions of the treaty of Versailles.

I recall these words of President Wilson in no invidious vein at all. I had the honor during the time that he crossed the continent of crossing the continent too, preaching the doctrine in which I believed and which I believe to-day, preaching that doctrine as best I could everywhere that Americans would assemble. In all that crossing of the continent I had naught, as I have naught now, to say except in praise of the President personally, although I disagreed most radically with his views.

What a pity it is that on a question like this, the question greatest that can come to the United States of America, the question, indeed, that involves the perpetuity of this great Republic itself—what a pity that it can not be argued in the United States of America without a hired press of international bankers intervening on the one side or the other. It is a pity that that is so, and that when a man speaks his heart he meets at once with every kind of vilification, denunciation, and abuse.

Remember the words that were here spoken only three short years ago about this treaty. No man on the other side, no man on this side, would repeat them to-day in eulogy of the treaty of Versailles. Remember what here is said by him in regard to the reparations and the Reparation Commission. No man in all the world, aye, even the spokesman of the administration itself, but writes the Reparation Commission to-day the rubber stamp of sinister ministries.

Remember, as you remember these things, how wrong you were then. Remember how the inexorable facts of time have proven and demonstrated you wrong, and, remembering that, be at least charitable in the view you hold of those who oppose an amendment such as this, that may be the forerunner of ills greater than any we have yet encountered.

The President yesterday, in his excellent communication to Senator Lodge, completely answered the request for the conference. I do not refer more particularly to this letter, because it speaks for itself. It is a vain and futile action, Senators, a vain and a futile action, and when, sir, with promises unfulfilled, with blighted hopes, Europe leaves the conference here, leaves it disgruntled, disappointed, and embittered, we have but intensified the tragic situation over there; and as the farmer who has been used here departs with empty hands and without relief, we have added to the discontent in this country. If, on the other hand, it be not a vain, a futile, and an idle thing, and if by the unwarranted threat of impending war we frighten this Republic into going into Europe's controversies, if we are taken from the path that has been ours ever since we have been a nation, if we are led through this measure into uncharted ways and are carried into foreign turmoil, the generations that are yet to come will hold us in obloquy for the wrong we do our common country.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I am not in favor of either the original provision as reported in the House text or the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and I shall very briefly state my reasons. The question before the Senate naturally divides itself, I think, into two parts—the provision of the House bill which calls for a conference for disarmament or further disarmament and limitation of

armaments, and the amendment of the Senator from Idaho extending the conference to economic considerations.

As to the disarmament conference which was held in Washington a year ago, I believe no other country was in a position to accomplish as much or could have accomplished as much as did the United States. It was removed from many of the controversies in Europe, from the economic difficulties and racial hatreds which rendered it impossible for those nations, without the influence of this country, to come to such an agreement. I have not the slightest doubt that, as stated by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], every effort was made to extend the limitations to auxiliary craft, such as aircraft and submarines, and to include disarmament of land forces. But as everyone knows, it was impossible to do so and it seems as though there would be no more prospect of succeeding now than at that time.

Conditions, of course, in Europe are worse than they were, but I doubt very much if they have become so bad that the European nations are willing to go further with disarmament. But it would certainly be unwise to rush into another disarmament conference until the treaties which were made at the last conference have been ratified by all the countries. If we should call another disarmament conference now, France would open up the whole subject and the treaties now pending before the French Chamber and Senate would never be ratified. Let France ratify those treaties before we start another conference.

Furthermore, the President would need to inquire of the various governments whether such a disarmament conference would be welcomed, whether it would have any prospects of success, and the President has ample authority to do this without an act of Congress. He has the authority under the Constitution to negotiate treaties and to call conferences for that purpose, and no act of Congress can limit that authority.

I do not think it is wise, therefore, at this time to adopt an amendment to the bill requesting the President to call a further disarmament conference, not that it would not be wise to have one. I think there should be a limitation of auxiliary craft. I think there should be a limitation of the great land forces that bear so heavily in taxes to-day upon the nations of Europe. But there seems to be no prospect that the President could, by calling a conference now before the other treaties have been ratified, accomplish such a purpose. I think the provision in the House bill is unwise.

The proposed economic conference assumes an entirely different aspect and should be considered from a different angle. I am not in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Idaho, but I do not place my opposition upon the ground that we should have nothing to do with the economic questions in Europe or that we can escape the effect of a financial breakdown and chaos in European countries. I agree with very much that was said by the Senator from Idaho, but I can not bring myself to believe that it is wise for the Congress to request the President to call an economic conference until he has some knowledge of the willingness of Europe to take steps to really remedy the conditions. Nor do I believe that it is possible for us to escape the effect of a breakdown in Europe or Europe's condition. The social and political influence of such a condition on our trade and commerce is so far-reaching that no one can say, in my opinion, that we can ignore this condition. But is Europe ready for it? Have the governments of Europe made up their minds to stop the ruinous inflation and governmental extravagance, to realize that their governments are bankrupt and to take drastic measures to place them upon a firm, substantial basis where the people can live and prosecute industry? In my judgment, there is no present indication that they are ready. However, I can but believe that many of the countries of Europe are fast approaching a condition of financial breakdown and perhaps political chaos, and that at some time not far distant there must be such an economic conference and drastic remedies applied.

I am not going to burden the Senate with a review of the financial condition of the various governments of Europe, but it may be instructive for those who have not studied the details of the conditions of the various countries to consider for a moment the condition of France.

The total debt of France to-day is 267,000,000,000 francs, or reduced to dollars in equivalent par exchange \$53,000,000,000, for a nation of 40,000,000 people. The total interest charge on the domestic debt of France, excluding her foreign debt to this country, is 12,000,000,000 francs per annum, or reduced to dollars at par exchange \$2,500,000,000 a year, which if paid in dollars would nearly equal our entire Government expense.

The foreign debt of France is 35,000,000,000 francs. That must be paid in exchange at par in gold. It amounts to \$7,000,000,000. The foreign debt adjusted to the average market rate

as of January 3, 1923, equals 85,000,000,000 francs instead of 35,000,000,000 francs. This would make the total debt in French currency 317,000,000,000 francs.

The interest charge on the internal debt in 1922 in France equals about 51 per cent of the total annual budget of the nation. At the rate France is increasing her obligations by issuing short-time notes it is estimated that in 1928 her interest charge alone for domestic debts will equal 76 per cent of her budget of 35,000,000,000 francs, or approximately 24,000,000,000 francs, which would be the interest on her domestic debt.

France has spent 90,000,000,000 francs in the restoration of the devastated region for which she was to receive reparation from Germany, and she has received about \$550,000,000 in cash, armistice deliveries, coal, and permanent properties in Alsace and Lorraine, of which only about \$35,000,000 was in cash upon reparations. It is estimated that only two-thirds of the restoration has taken place and that she will have to issue 45,000,000,000 francs more.

As matters stand, the French people by their own thrift and by use of their own savings have paid infinitely more to repair the damages done by the war than Germany has paid. Germany either can not or will not pay, and it is very difficult to make a Frenchman believe that if France can pay \$53,000,000,000 of debt Germany can not pay \$32,000,000,000. However, I am not prepared to say that either one can pay their obligations.

I am not going to discuss the other countries. Italy is in worse condition. I believe last year her budget did not balance the receipts by something like 6,000,000,000 lire, and it is estimated the coming year it will run up to 7,000,000,000 or 8,000,000,000 lire. England has not balanced her budget for four years and is paying out \$500,000,000 per annum in gold to unemployed labor.

I do not believe that the French Government will be able to pay the interest or principal of its domestic or foreign debt. But that is not all. In France the Government has borrowed the money from the people. A Frenchman having 1,000 francs in Government bonds or short-time notes can take them to the bank and borrow 80 per cent of their face value and buy some more, because they are paying 5 or 6 per cent. But once let France default upon the interest or fail to float loans to pay that interest, as she has done in the past, there is going to be a collapse in France. This may be a dark picture, but I believe the time is coming when there must be an economic conference in Europe. I do not say that it will be necessary for us to be a party to it, but we may, with profit to ourselves and the world, participate in it. I do not believe, however, that time has yet come. When the countries of Europe make up their minds that they are bankrupt, that they can not pay their internal debts and their external debts, and are ready to scale down both of those obligations, to wipe off the hundreds of billions of inflated currency which they have issued, to put their affairs on a basis where their people can pay their taxes and live and carry on industry and commerce, then it will be time for this country, if invited, to join with them and to use its influence and participate in such a conference.

I, for one, would be willing when the time comes for this country to scale the debt which is due it in proportion to what European countries are willing to scale their domestic and foreign debts, but it is perfectly idle for us to forego our debt and allow the billions upon hundreds of billions of domestic debts in Europe to be paid. It would be like pouring water into the ocean.

Europe, however, is not ready for that. Inflation to an astonishing degree is going on. Germany has a thousand billion marks of paper currency, and is issuing additional marks at the rate, approximately, of one hundred and fifty billions per month. Of course, Germany's internal debt is a joke; it never can be collected and never will be.

France is issuing short-term Government obligations, which she is selling to her people on the basis of 5 and 6 per cent, which is only a disguised form of inflation.

Mr. President, what is to be gained by adopting an amendment to the pending bill requesting the President immediately to call a conference of European powers in Washington, in which we shall participate, until the nations of Europe make up their minds that, like the insolvent debtor, they must scale their debts, must stop their inflation, and must put themselves upon a basis where the people may live, pay their taxes, and advance in civilization?

There is another reason why the President should not be requested to call a conference now. If he is so requested, we shall be met by a law which requires the Debt Commission to settle the foreign debt on the basis of receiving bonds for 25 years at 4½ per cent. Furthermore, by the deliberate action of the Senate, we declined to participate in the activities of the

Reparation Commission, as the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has stated. Reparations, the debts of Germany and the debts of France, lie at the foundation of an economic adjustment in Europe. I believe such an adjustment has got to come; I believe that we are very much interested in it, for we can not escape the consequences of a collapse in Europe. I disagree only with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] in the wisdom of requesting the President at this time to call an economic conference with European nations.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, when the treaty of Versailles was under consideration by the Senate of the Sixty-sixth Congress there were some of us who showed less concern with either Article X or any other provision of the covenant of the League of Nations than with the unconscionable exactions of territory and payments in money or in kind which the victors laid upon the vanquished through the stipulations of the treaty itself. Early in that prolonged discussion I took occasion to enumerate and to analyze those exactions and to point out that their unenforced and unenforceable features contained the germ of future wars and constituted a continuing menace to world peace and prosperity. It is scant satisfaction now, Mr. President, to say "I told you so"; but the slithering down of Europe into the misery and suffering which the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has so movingly described is a direct result of the wholly impossible purposes which the treaty makers of Versailles sought to attain. The United States—properly, as I shall always believe—declined to become a party to that compact; and whatever its consequences, we are blameless.

The existing difficulties, therefore, not being of our making, we are measurably powerless to solve them. I do not mean by this, sir, that we might not find somewhere in the welter of proposals which most certainly would be laid before a conference such as the Senator from Idaho has projected some palliative anodyne which would temporarily relieve the distress of the Old World. But no permanent cure can be found in anything which we alone might do—and it is we alone who will be called upon not only to prescribe but to administer whatever treatment an international consultation held now shall determine upon. In consequence of these views I can not support the pending amendment, nor will I approve any similar proposal at any time prior to a sincere effort on the part of Europe itself to better its own condition.

Already, Mr. President, incalculable harm has been brought to Europe by the mere fact of this proposal being made. Famished and voracious peoples again visualize the United States as a geographic Christmas tree. In their minds again floats the picture of plethoric Uncle Sam, warm-hearted and generous, opening his purse to the hand of need whether meritorious or meretricious. They dream dreams of more loans of huge sums without either security or maturity; and in imagination they are already spending our money not for the relief of national or individual suffering but in preparation for more joy rides of imperialism, militarism, and aggrandizement. It is true, sir, that our Department of State in the event that the proposed conference should be summoned would draw its agenda; but like many a preacher, who having taken a text preaches from it, we would surely find the conference collaterally raising questions which are not directly within its purview, and the result of which would be to entangle and embroil the United States in all the jealousies and rivalries of the Old World. Our dread of this was the moving cause for our rejection of the treaty of Versailles; and none who held to this opinion can ever forget or sufficiently reward the senior Senator from Idaho for the valiant and successful leadership which he gave to our earlier action here, nor for the vigor and eloquence with which he swayed the minds of his fellow countrymen when the issue was taken to them in a great and solemn referendum. Three times the American people have rejected such a proposal—twice by constitutional vote in this representative body and once by the direct voice of the people, who by a majority of 7,000,000 approved of our action. Three times Columbia has refused to enter the fantastic household of the Versailles treaty by the front door; yet there are now those who seek in some way to boost her up over the back fence or to push her in through the basement window. I do not believe, sir, that the temper of the American electorate is more forbearing now toward these efforts of indirection than it was when the direct attempt was made to load us with the obligations and implications of the Versailles treaty.

The propaganda to entangle us in European affairs has never ceased. From those early days of 1919, when the highly profitable import of the Versailles treaty dawned in its richness upon the dazzled minds of the scantily victorious Allies and their profiteering partners—the international bankers—the United

States has swarmed with propagandists, official and unofficial, sentimental and salaried, all dinning into our ears the strong word "must" and all pointing to us the path of our duty, which they themselves have charted and which leads direct and only to benefits for themselves. I think, sir, that the United States is weary of all this; that the United States deems itself competent to find its own line of duty and to follow it; and that we need no guidance save that of our own conscience, which hitherto has never failed and never will.

Mr. President, I stand in opposition not only to the conference proposed by the Borah amendment now but in opposition to any like conference originating anywhere or at any time prior to a more complete understanding here of the conditions which exist in Europe or prior to any sincere and persistent attempt on the part of European nations to free themselves from the burden of their own folly. It is obvious, sir, that the mere superficial view of distress abroad, which has never failed to produce a sympathetic and generous reaction in the American soul, and which in the present instance has already found expression in public and private benefactions for alleviation of individual misery—it is obvious, I say, that such an appeal can not serve continuously to bleed the American pocketbook. Sooner or later there must be some cessation of the constant stream of American philanthropy, and while it may seem momentarily cruel for America to withdraw utterly from all contact with the economic problems of Europe, I feel certain that such a course would not fail to emphasize to Europe that which Europe most needs, namely, a realization of its own madness.

I have said, sir, that the present plight of the Old World is due much more chiefly to an insane insistence upon the nominations in the bond of Versailles than to any other cause. That treaty far transcended any ever before written in the ferocity of its demands. Having decided upon the ultimate shred of the pound of flesh, in which the United States claimed no share, those who divided the raiment of their foe thought each to secure the lion's share. But the lion's share fell only to the Lion; and after England had seized for herself colonies, mandatory rights, and accretions of population almost beyond enumeration, to France was allotted a majority percentage in a money reparation impossible to collect or even to secure properly. Yet both peoples, the English and French, have continued to nourish a dream of repayment and to look for the fairy godmother who will bring them riches. Great Britain, speaking through her only remaining proconsul, has served notice that Mosul must remain in her possession, while her prime minister synchronously expresses his horror at the thought of a French occupation of the Ruhr region. Meantime English capital, sometimes openly but more often subterraneously, has been taking possession of German port facilities and means of transportation; so that when English efforts, combined with misguided convictions in our own country, have swept the American flag from the ocean, we shall find the cross of St. George once more signaling not only the mastery of the seas but also a domination of the land which will completely handicap every nation which seeks to enter into fair competition.

Back of all this, Mr. President, lies the fundamental error in financing the war on the part of those who now suffer most grievously from its reactions. Our belated entrance into the conflict was marked by a speedy resolution, well carried out, to distribute war's burdens equitably between generations now on earth and the generations yet to come. Beyond the limit of any nation with whom we were associated, the United States laid its taxes for war purposes, and still continues them; whereas France, to mention the most conspicuous example on the other hand, has had no balanced budget since 1870, has pyramided her public securities in an incredible amount, and at the same time has provoked a condition wherein the tax dodger has become a hero. Under these circumstances, sir, not all the financial resources of the United States, though freely and fully placed at the disposal of distressed Europe, could bring about permanent relief. Our stream of gold would disappear into a rat hole whose labyrinths run off into the highways of maintained armaments, undiminished nationalistic ambitions, and unchecked militarism, in the face of which it may be that the time has come for the United States to turn the tables upon the peoples of Europe and for us to send to them a stream of propagandists to admonish them to their duty and tell them what they must do.

It is significant, Mr. President, that the one nation of Europe, as largely ravaged by war as any other, which has made the most speedy recovery is the one nation of Europe which wholeheartedly has gone to work. It is Belgium, whose currency has fluctuated less, whose despoliment has been most speedily restored, and whose industry has produced

the most striking results. When, in the summer of 1920, a ship from Antwerp entered the harbor of New York with a cargo of potatoes sent to the American market from that Belgium which a few years before was feeding from our dole, the world was furnished with its most striking example of recovery from devastating warfare. And what Belgium has done others may do. The Kingdom of God lies within not only the individual but the nation; and until the nations of Europe make some attempt to work out their own salvation I shall continue to oppose any further use of American agencies to solve Europe's problems.

Had we thrust our hands into this abhorrent mess at the outset, Mr. President, through the ratification of the treaty of Versailles, it may be that the power of our influence would have made that instrument operative. Even so, it would have been at the cost of others, and it is improbable that some of the consequences which now confront the world could have been obviated in any event. If we now take up the task it is certain that the cost and consequences will recoil only upon ourselves, and until Europe sees fit to become just there is no occasion for us to be unduly generous.

The implications of what is now proposed can not be winked out of sight. The letter of the President read here on Thursday contains some hint of them. If we engage in any conference such as is here outlined, or in any conference held prior to some earnest attempt on Europe's part to clean her own house, we shall find ourselves in the anomalous and disagreeable position of making decisions between two equally balanced groups of contenders. Our absence from the reparations table leaves the Reparation Commission equally divided upon substantially every question which has thus far arisen. The representatives of England and Belgium generally vote together, with the representatives of France and Italy grouped in opposition. To us, if we sat there, or whenever we sit there, would fall the decisive vote and the decision of the umpire. Our national game, sir, daily demonstrates the uncomfortable position which the umpire occupies; and I have no desire to see Uncle Sam "beamed" by a pop bottle thrown from the European bleachers. [Laughter.]

The only conference which can ever be summoned to produce a satisfactory or efficient solution for the ills of Europe is a conference composed of the powers signatory and adhering to the treaty of Versailles with the purpose completely to rewrite its provisions, to eliminate the greed which marks its every paragraph, to recast the illogical and impossible boundaries which it has set up, and to adjust the compensation for the foe's aggression in a fixed and possible sum and in a manner capable of execution. Until such a conference is called I shall oppose the participation of my country in any other.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHORTRIDGE in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	Lodge	Sheppard
Ball	France	McCormick	Shortridge
Bayard	Gerry	McCumber	Smoot
Borah	Glass	McKellar	Spencer
Brookhart	Hale	McKinley	Stanfield
Broussard	Harris	McNary	Sterling
Bursum	Heflin	Moses	Sutherland
Calder	Hitchcock	Nelson	Townsend
Cameron	Johnson	New	Trammell
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Nicholson	Underwood
Caraway	Jones, Wash.	Norbeck	Walsh, Mont.
Colt	Kellogg	Oddie	Warren
Culberson	Kendrick	Page	Watson
Curtis	Keyes	Pepper	Weller
Dial	King	Philpps	Williams
Dillingham	Ladd	Poinexter	
Ernst	La Follette	Pomerene	
Fernald	Lenroot	Reed, Mo.	

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] is necessarily absent by reason of a death in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if the situation in Europe be considered such that it is unnecessary for us to be interested in the problem of its adjustment, or if it be regarded as such that we can escape the consequences which may follow from even a more serious condition, I can at least understand the position of those who oppose any consideration whatever of the situation. My own position has been based upon the theory that the situation at this time throughout Europe is such that the United States must necessarily be deeply interested, not only from a humanitarian standpoint, but from our economic and business viewpoint also. I understood from the President's letter that

it was conceded that the situation was such that we were deeply concerned; that the Executive was giving careful consideration to the entire subject matter; and we were also advised by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] that actual negotiations were going on as to how we could adjust the economic conditions of Europe. If, however, it be regarded from another standpoint—that the Executive is not primarily concerned because it is not of sufficient moment to concern him, or if we as a people may pass it by as a matter of no concern—then, of course, I can comprehend the position of the opponents of action.

Mr. President, as I said at the beginning of this controversy, before the amendment came up for debate, my mind has been open and still is open as to the method by which we should proceed.

I have an impression, a very strong one, that a conference such as I have in mind is far safer and will be far more effective than any method of dealing with the situation through secret channels or merely diplomatic channels. In that I may be in error, but my belief in the open treatment of all questions with which the public is concerned has led me to think, as I thought with reference to the disarmament conference, that an open treatment of such propositions by the duly constituted delegates to a conference is far more effective and accomplishes greater results than any other method which we could adopt.

I do not think for a moment that had the question of disarmament been left to a series of letters or communications between the foreign offices of the different governments we would ever have arrived at any conclusion of substantial benefit at all. Had it not been for the power of public opinion beating in on the conference here in Washington, had it not been for the power of public opinion, both here in the United States and among the masses in all the countries represented, I venture to say that the difficulties which arose in that conference would never have been adjusted.

With reference to this situation, I view it in the same light. As the able Senator from California well said, we have had conferences and conferences, but they have not been of the nature of the conference which we had here in Washington a year ago, or of the nature of the conference which I have in mind and which I assume the President would conduct if the conference were held. I feel very certain that until the power of public opinion is permitted to exert itself, until the countless millions upon whom this burden falls at the present time are permitted to influence the situation, things will go from bad to worse until they will either suffer incalculably from an economic disaster or from that which is even worse, another conflict.

It has always been contended, and I think with some degree of effectiveness, that had the nations of the earth been permitted to have a conference between the 1st day of July and the 1st day of August, 1914, and had the masses of the people been advised of the fact that war was at hand, a different situation and a different condition of affairs would have resulted upon the 4th day of August, 1914. The people knew nothing of that condition of affairs until the war was upon them, until the diplomats and those representing the Governments had actually brought the thing to the point where there was bloodshed. I believe in conferences and have always believed in conferences, and I believe in this conference.

As I said a moment ago, I interpreted the President's letter in connection with the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] as evidencing the fact that negotiations were being had to accomplish exactly the same thing I have in view with reference to the conference, and that it was simply a difference of view as to the method. I venture to believe that if that is true there is justification for a difference of view as to the most effective method of dealing with the problem.

Mr. President, I know of no way, other than three, to adjust differences between the nations of the earth when difficulties arise. The first is through diplomatic channels, and that is in the nature of a conference; second, through an open conference, such as has often been provided for and often been held by our own Government with European nations; third, by entering into a permanent arrangement—a permanent alliance or a permanent league—through and by means of which a conference can always be called when an emergency or an exigency arises.

I have always been opposed to a permanent committal on the part of the Government, undertaking to protrude ourselves into the future, and to determine in advance of the development of the facts as to what our course might be. On the other hand, I have been an advocate of the proposition that when an exigency arises, and conditions are such as to call for consideration upon the part of the governments for the purpose of preventing war, a conference ought to be called

for the purpose of dealing with that exigency; and, so far as I understood the doctrine with which we have been dealing for the last three or four years, it was a contention between those who believed we ought to have a permanent institution, a permanent understanding, or permanent machinery, and those who believed we could deal with exigencies better when an actual exigency arose, we were opposed to a previous committal or a previous understanding by virtue of a league or alliance, those in favor of a league being in favor of creating such permanent machinery.

That has been my view; it is still my understanding of the proposition, and I venture to say that there is no so-called irreconcilable upon this side of the Chamber who has not indulged that proposition. We have all stood, either by direct or indirect declaration, in favor of conferences or cooperation whenever an exigency should arise which seemed to demand that we have such a conference in the interest of our country. But we have stood against permanent leagues or alliances which committed us to a course of action prior to a knowledge of the actual facts.

I say again that if it be contended and successfully contended that there is no such situation now, that we are not actually involved in these things, and that we need not be involved in them, then there is no occasion for a conference; but if the situation be conceded to be such as I understand it to be and as I believe it to be, then there is a necessity for one of two things, either the acceptance of a method through permanent machinery or the use of the old-established method of the United States; that is, calling a conference when the actual conditions demand it. I can not believe that we can escape this situation.

Every writer, every student, every traveler who comes to deal with the proposition or who has studied it upon the ground advances the belief that European conditions are such now that they are already affecting very seriously conditions in the United States, and that they must necessarily do so more in the future. I am going to read a paragraph or two from an article which appears in the January number of the Review of Reviews from the noted war correspondent and journalist, Frank H. Simonds, who has been a student of European affairs for years, one of the men who was on the ground in Europe during the war, and has been there for months; he has just lately returned. He reviews this situation in an article entitled "Europe at the turn of the year," and says:

Taking the dying year as a whole, it can not be denied that it has been in the main the most discouraging since the end of the war. There has been a steady disintegration, a disintegration in many nations and a disintegration in international relations. * * *

Actually we find ourselves as the year closes facing what must be considered the gravest of Franco-German crises since 1919, for it is marked both by desperation and impotence on both sides. France, like Germany, has become in a sense the victim of the tide running inevitably toward that supreme catastrophe, which at least for Great Britain and America is expressed in the obvious likelihood of new military operations and fresh economic anarchy.

Further, he says:

It is idle to presume that things are righting themselves or that there is any visible evidence that they will. I found on the Continent in March and April a sense of despair absent in the bitterest days of the war, and those who return in December only report the intensification of this feeling of depression. * * *

And it is well to perceive at the outset that we have arrived at the supreme crisis. Things must now worsen or brighten with small delay, for the mere continuation of existing conditions spells ruin for Germany, for France, and for most if not all continental countries. What exists can not endure.

Mr. President, here is the crisis, if we are correct in our view of the situation, a deadlock between France and Germany with reference to what the Senator from California very properly says is the key to the situation, and with him I fully agree, the question of the adjustment of reparations. Possibly the able Senator may be right in saying that the situation could go on and not grow worse, or, if growing worse, that we can escape its consequences. I am ordinarily more willing to trust his prophecy than my own; but, speaking with such light as I have upon the subject, I am of the opinion that it can not go on without growing worse, and that it can not grow worse without our feeling in a tremendous way the evil consequences.

I venture to say that that is the exact view of the President of the United States, judging from his letter. So, as I understand it, it is not a controversy here as to whether we are interested or as to whether we can escape it, but it is a mere question of whether or not this is the proper method of handling the situation.

Mr. President, the very able Senator from California spoke, in his inimitable way and with his extraordinary power, concerning the ridiculousness of conferences. There is much justification for what he said. I shall not undertake to answer with reference to many of the things to which he called our

attention in that regard, but I do call the Senator's attention to the fact that such has not been the result of all conferences. When Japan and Russia were in a deadlock, when they were engaged in war, and when their contentions seemed to invite other great nations of the world, and it was purely a foreign question so far as we were concerned, if any question can be a foreign question, the President of the United States invited those powers to a conference; and as a result of the conference, an agreement or a treaty of reconciliation and peace was adjusted between the powers.

It might have been said in advance of the calling of that conference, "What is the use to call it? Here are two powers engaged in deadly conflict. How shall we as a Nation undertake to settle the difficulties unless we involve ourselves in the controversy which arises between them?" That controversy was over the question of territory, the question of transportation lines—over political, economic, and territorial questions all. But Colonel Roosevelt called the European powers to the American shores, took them out of the atmosphere of controversy, broke the deadlock, and brought to peace that which might have resulted in a world war at that time.

It might have been said, as it is said now, that if we called these nations together we would be under moral obligation to underwrite the transactions of the one or the other or to see that one or the other fulfilled its guaranties.

Japan was to turn back certain territory and Russia was to get certain transportation advantages of the situation, and there was a distribution with reference to material interest, all of which guaranties had to be fulfilled in the future. But we were under no obligation and were not considered under any obligation to underwrite the fulfillment of the contract or to underwrite the fulfillment of the treaty. We brought the nations together and adjusted a conflict, adjusted the differences between them, and sent the nations home from the shores of America to follow out their contract. Was that a breach of the traditional policies of the United States? Was that in violation of the doctrine of no entanglement with foreign powers? It was not so considered. It would be in the face of reason and history to so contend. And are the irreconcilables opposed to such things as that?

Another illustration, Mr. President: It was at the instance of the President of the United States at that time, Colonel Roosevelt, that the second Hague conference was called. I read from the record of the second Hague conference:

The second international peace conference, proposed in the first instance by the President of the United States of America, having been convoked on the invitation of His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, by Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands, assembled June 5, 1907.

We met there in company with 47 or 48 nations of Europe, we making the forty-eighth or forty-ninth. We met for the purpose of adjusting and providing for arbitral methods of adjustment of all the difficulties or all the conflicts which might arise in Europe or in the world. It was said at the time of that meeting that this was an entire breach of the policy of isolation. As Professor Hazen, in his book "Europe Since 1815," said:

That the problem—

Of The Hague—

concerned all the world; that Asia and America were as truly involved as Europe—

In the adjustment—

that the day of isolation is over, when a nation may live unto itself, was shown in the address of the president of the conference, M. de Staal, a Russian delegate.

Then, Mr. President, I ask to have those remarks inserted in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

That the problem concerned all the world; that Asia and America were as truly involved as Europe; that the day of isolation is over, when a nation may live unto itself, was shown in the address of the president of the conference, M. de Staal, a Russian delegate. "We perceive between nations," said he, "an amount of material and moral interests which is constantly increasing. The ties which unite all parts of the human family are ever becoming closer. A nation could not remain isolated if it wished. * * * If, therefore, the nations are united by ties so multifarious, is there no room for seeking the consequences arising from this fact? When a dispute arises between two or more nations, others, without being concerned directly, are profoundly affected. The consequences of an international conflict occurring in any portion of the globe are felt on all sides. It is for this reason that outsiders can not remain indifferent to the conflict—they are bound to endeavor to appease it by conciliatory action." Among the means suggested are mediation and arbitration. On another occasion the same member said: "The forces of human activity are absorbed in an increasing proportion by the expenses of the military and naval budgets. * * * Armed peace to-day causes more considerable expense than the most burdensome war of modern times"; and another Russian delegate exclaimed: "The idea of the Emperor of Russia is grand and generous. * * * If not this first conference, it will be a future conference which will accept the idea, for it responds to the wants of all nations."

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, at the same time or previously there was incorporated in the proceedings of The Hague this declaration:

Nothing contained in this convention shall be so construed as to require the United States of America to depart from its traditional policy of not intruding upon, interfering with, or entangling itself in the political questions or policy or internal administration of any foreign state; nor shall anything in the said convention be construed to imply a relinquishment by the United States of America of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions.

Thus preserving both the doctrine as announced by Washington and the doctrine as announced by Monroe in the contemplation of those who took part in The Hague conference.

I cite this simply to impress the idea that we have always believed in avoiding difficulties either by an extraordinary conference or through some permanent machinery for the purpose of bringing in the nations whenever the difficulty should arise. Here were two instances in which this was accomplished and they are notable precedents in our affairs. So it can not always be said that conferences are a failure. It may be said that ultimately when the Great War came The Hague conference broke down, and so it did. But it did adjust many difficulties and may do so in the future. Whether it was efficient or inefficient, it was not deemed in contravention to our established or traditional policy so long as properly guarded.

One more illustration, Mr. President. In 1907 a great war was threatened by reason of conditions prevailing in Morocco. It was, as I understand, although of this I can not speak authoritatively, upon the initiative of President Roosevelt that the Congress or peace conference at Algieras was called in 1907. But whether it was called at his request or not, the United States attended with its duly accredited representative.

The idea of observers had not at that time occurred to the fertile mind of the ex-President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt. He was not by nature a mere observer. He sent men there to represent us, with due authority to represent us, and they did sit in the conference and did assist in adjusting the matters, and history informs us that it was through the leadership of the American representatives or through their dominance in the conference that many of the difficult questions which at one time seemed insuperable were finally adjusted.

That conference had to do almost exclusively with European affairs. There were 15 nations finally gathered at the conference. The only nations which were directly interested were France, Spain, and Great Britain, but ultimately, by reason of the action of Germany, Germany came also to be considered as one having a primary interest in the situation. Sixteen nations including our own adjusted every question relative to a foreign government or to a European government. The question of policing the government, the setting up of an established government, the question of creating a government bank and of running a government bank, the question of transportation, the question of collecting revenue, the question of rehabilitating and establishing a broken-down government in the heart of Europe or on that continent were there effected through the Algieras conference. It was believed at the time that if the matter continued war would inevitably result between Germany and France and possibly spread to the other larger nations of Europe.

I read a line or paragraph from the treaty which was finally signed at Algieras and which we signed as one of the treaty-making powers. The United States was a signatory to that adjustment. The treaty said:

Inspired by the interest attaching itself to the reign of order, peace, and prosperity in Morocco, and recognizing that the attainment thereof can only be effected by means of the introduction of reforms based upon the triple principle of the sovereignty and independence of His Majesty the Sultan, the integrity of his domains, and economic liberty without any inequality, have resolved, upon the invitation of His Shereefian Majesty, to call a conference at Algieras for the purpose of arriving at an understanding upon the said reforms as well as examining the means for obtaining the resources necessary for their application, and have appointed as their delegates plenipotentiary the following.

Then appears the names of the delegates of some 15 or 16 powers. At the close of the treaty is this statement:

The Government of the United States of America, having no political interest in Morocco and no desire or purpose having animated it to take part in this conference other than to secure for all peoples the widest equality of trade and privilege with Morocco and to facilitate the institution of reforms in that country tending to insure complete cordiality of intercourse without and stability of administration within for the common good, declares that, in acquiescing in the regulations and declarations of the conference, in becoming a signatory to the general act of Algieras and to the additional protocol, subject to ratification according to constitutional procedure, and in accepting the application of those regulations and declarations to American citizens and interests in Morocco, it does so without assuming obligation or responsibility for the enforcement thereof.

Now, I concede that the danger which the able Senator from California contemplates might arise. I am perfectly willing to admit that out of a conference might come an effort of guaranty. But it is not necessary either in fact or upon

precedent. I would not feel bound by such a course. I know we can do our full duty and sacrifice no part of our traditional policies. But I feel that if we do not do our full duty we will be brought to a condition where, all for which we contended in that long struggle will be lost. We must have a working program or that which is offered by others, if the emergency becomes dire enough, will be accepted. If the adjustment could be brought about it could likely be brought about under such conditions, if it were desired, as to enable us to deal with the situation as we dealt with these other conditions.

But, on the other hand, while the situation might give rise to these conditions, they could in all probability, or at least if the desire were at hand to do so, be adjusted without any such obligation.

When the Senate ratified this treaty it said:

The Senate understands that the participation of the United States in the Algeiras conference and in the formulation and adoption of the general act and protocol which resulted therefrom was with the sole purpose of preserving and increasing its commerce in Morocco, the protection as to life, liberty, and property of its citizens residing or traveling therein, and of aiding by its friendly offices and efforts in removing friction and controversy which seemed to menace the peace between the powers signatory with the United States to the treaty of 1880, all of which are on terms of amity with this Government; and without purpose to depart from the traditional American foreign policy which forbids participation by the United States in the settlement of political questions which are entirely European in their scope.

Mr. President, I do not regard the proposed economic conference which has for its purpose, if possible, the establishment of conditions which might bring about peace, as being in contravention to any view which those who are opposed to the League of Nations ever advocated. Perhaps I ought to speak only for myself; but, so far as I am individually concerned, I have more than once upon the floor of the Senate, indeed I have a number of times on the floor of the Senate and on the rostrum, stated that I had no doubt as to the responsibility and as to the obligation of this Government with reference to effecting peace throughout the world. I objected to the permanent alliance or permanent league which undertakes to commit us in advance of the conditions which may arise at any particular time.

I do not know, as I have stated, of any irreconcilable, so called, upon this side of the Chamber but who has advocated that doctrine. We have expressed it in different ways. The able Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] ridicules the idea of conferences, but he was a candidate for Vice President in 1912 upon a platform which can not be construed in any other light, as I understand, than as being in accord with some method of settlement, some method of peaceful arrangement, some adjustment of difficulties, either through permanent arrangements or permanent alliances or permanent leagues or by the conference which may be called when the exigency arises. That platform provided:

The Progressive Party deplores the survival in our civilization of the barbaric system of warfare among nations, with its enormous waste of resources even in time of peace, and the consequent impoverishment of the life of the toiling masses. We pledge the party to use its best endeavors to substitute judicial and other peaceful means of settling international difficulties.

We favor an international agreement for the limitation of naval forces.

In what way, Mr. President, can we arrive at a settlement of international difficulties; what is the process other than that of either a permanent league or a permanent alliance or a conference when the situation arises, except that of war? The declaration of that platform was to the effect that there should be some other method than that of war by which to effectuate a settlement of such difficulties. We have never taken the position, as I understand, that we could not come in contact with the other nations of the earth; that we are separate and apart from the family of nations; that we have no part or parcel with them. We can only differ, as differ we do sometimes, as to the method by which to deal with them.

In 1919 we all signed what is known as the "round robin," wherein we said:

It is the sense of the Senate that, while it is their sincere desire that the nations of the world should unite to promote peace and general disarmament, the constitution of the League of Nations in the form now proposed should not be accepted by the United States—

And so forth.

How shall the nations of the earth unite for the purpose of perpetuating peace or for the purpose of preventing war or for the purpose of reducing armament? There can be no other way than that which has been outlined in the pending amendment, by a specific conference or a league of some kind.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and I were all signers of that declaration, and

never at any time did we take the position in contesting against a permanent alliance that there might not be exigencies in which we should be called upon to cooperate with the other nations of the earth.

The platform which was adopted at Chicago in 1920, upon which the Republican Party is now in power, specifically endorsed conferences as distinguished from leagues or alliances. It reads:

The Republican Party stands for agreement among the nations to preserve the peace of the world. We believe that such an international association must be based upon international justice, and must provide methods which shall maintain the rule of public right by the development of law and the decision of impartial courts, and which shall secure instant and general international conference whenever peace shall be threatened by political action.

So far as that platform relates to the question of international conferences, if I may be permitted to make a personal allusion, I made a special plea to have that provision inserted—and I was at the conference at the time—for the purpose of providing special conferences as distinguished from permanent or established tribunals such as were at that time contemplated.

During the long debate on this subject at different times I declared it our duty to deal with world affairs, but always urging that we should meet them when they arose, something in this way—the way proposed in this amendment. In December, 1918, I said:

I fully understand that we have as a people come into a wider circle of influence and under graver responsibilities than we have known heretofore. I acknowledge in full our duty toward the peace of the world, our deep, vital interest in sustaining and extending and strengthening the domain of international law. I would, as a nation, shirk from no duty; I would meet every obligation.

Upon another occasion, long after the war, I said:

In this stupendous and bewildering crisis America must do her part. No true American wants to see her shirk any part of her responsibility. There are no advocates of selfishness, none so fatuous as to urge that we may be happy and prosperous while the rest of the world is plunging on in misery and want. Call it providence, call it fate, but we know that in the nexus of things there must be something of a common sharing, all but universal and inexorable, in the burdens which these great catastrophes place upon the human family. It is not only written in the Great Book, but it is written in the economic laws of nature, "Bear ye one another's burdens." We do not differ as to the duty of America, we differ only as to the manner in which she shall discharge that duty.

I know of no way to meet the emergencies other than by conferences, unless we propose to go into a permanent league.

I call attention to these considerations, Mr. President, because my friends, with whom I associated in that contest, seem to think that this amendment is in contravention of our traditional policy. Possibly it may be so in the view which they take of it, but certainly it is not so in the view which I take of it and concerning which I have many times expressed myself on public rostrum and also here in the Senate. To my mind, nothing could be further from history and from the facts than to say that these conferences are without results.

Mr. President, what are we going to do in face of the situation now confronting us? Are we going to abandon entirely the idea of undertaking to adjust the economic difficulties of Europe, or is the present situation just such a one as has arisen time and time again when the interests of the United States were directly affected and when it was necessary to deal with and cooperate with the nations of the world in order to bring about an adjustment? If the United States is concerned—and deeply concerned—then if not a conference, what is the plan?

I can very well understand how those view the situation who say that a public conference is not the way to accomplish the desired result; I can understand those who think that diplomatic channels afford a safer and securer and better way to attempt a solution of the difficulty; but I do not understand those who say there is nothing here which concerns. That is a blindness which is incomprehensible. I do not believe that it is possible to escape from its consequences. I think it is true, as I have heretofore said, that we are even now in the midst of it; that we are a part of it; that we are actually dealing with it at the present time, and must continue to deal with it in one way or another until matters are finally adjusted.

I read in a morning newspaper a most remarkable declaration upon the part of one of our representatives in Europe, Mr. Child, our ambassador to Italy, who is now attending the Lausanne conference. I quote from the newspaper article:

Ambassador Child's warning—

Warning, mark you—

that Turkey will align herself with other nations which have repudiated their obligations if she wipes out all the capitulation and does not grant something instead as a guaranty of her treaty pledges created a marked

impression on the conference and was gratifying to the allied delegates, who regarded the address as advice to Turkey not to isolate herself, as Russia has done.

It may be said, Mr. President, that that is not binding upon the United States in the technical sense of the term, and so I would be willing to concede, but it is binding upon the United States in the broader sense of the term, because we are there insisting upon a certain course; we are dealing with foreign nations and with foreign subjects matter, and our ambassador warns another nation of the earth that a certain course, if followed, will be objectionable to the United States. Will men refuse to concede the plain inevitable effect of such representation? Talk about not being in Europe! That does not rise even to the dignity of sophistry. Talk about not being involved, and getting deeper day by day. And we will continue to drive farther and farther so long as the reparations question is unsettled, for that unsettles all Europe.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. MOSES. Does not the Senator understand that we have an existing treaty with Turkey which formulates the capitulations and that under those capitulations Americans living and doing business in Turkey suffer the penalties of justice through the foreign courts?

Mr. BORAH. Precisely.

Mr. MOSES. Does that make the situation parallel to the one which the Senator has been discussing?

Mr. BORAH. The contention has been made here that Mr. Child was simply there as an observer. If the Senator from New Hampshire is correct in his interpretation, Mr. Child ought to be there as an official.

Mr. MOSES. Not necessarily.

Mr. BORAH. Why not necessarily? That would seem to be the ordinary course, would it not? Why should he be merely an observer if we are there properly to deal with the protection of our treaty rights and that is the purpose of being there?

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, the question of the capitulations was not within the purview, as I understand, of the agenda of the Lausanne conference at the time it was called. As I tried to point out in the few remarks which I made earlier in the day, that is the difficulty with the conference, that it goes far afield from the questions which were supposedly to be discussed.

Mr. BORAH. But, Mr. President—

Mr. MOSES. If the Senator will allow me a word further, the question of capitulations is one which has been uppermost for many years in dealing with Mohammedan and other countries which we are pleased to call pagan. So far as the Turkish capitulations are concerned, they extend not only to the continental possessions of the Turkish Empire but even into Egypt, where Americans have been living under treaties containing capitulation provisions. I do not understand that when the agenda of the Lausanne conference was first broached the question of capitulations even remotely was under consideration.

Mr. BORAH. No; it was not; but Mr. Child was there prior to the time that the capitulations or any other subject in which we are directly interested had arisen. Mr. Child participated in the conference from the beginning at a time when matters in which we are directly interested had not yet arisen, so far as the press reports give us the information, and he has been there from the beginning, dealing with all the subjects matter about which the conference saw fit to deal.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, if the Senator is directing the burden of his present remarks and those that have just proceeded them to the thesis that we should not have official representatives on these bodies, and particularly on the Reparation Commission, I entirely agree with him. I am not at all in accord with the policy of the present administration or the policy of the preceding administration, whereby Mr. Boyden is maintained in Paris as an official observer in connection with the Reparation Commission and is paid from the German reparations fund, upon which we have laid claim to not a single penny. I quite agree with the Senator if that is what he is attempting to set up.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator is in error about our not having laid claim to any part of the fund referred to. We have laid claim to it, for we specifically provided in the German treaty, for which the able Senator voted, that we should have all the benefits of the terms of the Versailles treaty which had been accorded to the United States, and one of them was the payment of the expenses of the Reparation Commission, on which we are now sitting.

Mr. MOSES. But we have never formulated such claims or made demands for them, have we? Has there been any repudiation of the statement of President Wilson at Paris that the United States did not seek and would not take reparations?

Mr. BORAH. I do not know of any repudiation. It was provided that the expenses of the Reparation Commission should be paid by Germany, and the Germans have obligated themselves by the Versailles treaty to pay the expenses of the Reparation Commission. Of course, we have not collected, and we will not collect for many, many years. They obligated themselves to pay for the troops upon the Rhine. By the German treaty, which was ratified, we claimed both those rights, and we now have our official representative there—call him "observer" or call him what you may—observing and taking part in the transactions, and the Germans are paying him just exactly as they are paying all other members of the Reparation Commission; and we have our troops there just the same as the other Governments have, and the troops are being charged to the Germans the same as the French troops, and we claim the right under the Versailles treaty, by reason of the German treaty, to collect that amount.

Mr. MOSES. I agree with all that the Senator says in its essence—that we have a representative in some way connected with the Reparation Commission—and I agree with the Senator that he is paid directly from the German reparations fund; I agree with the Senator that we have troops on the Rhine, whose upkeep is an obligation against the German Government; and I hope the Senator is in agreement with me also that neither of those things has proper legal status under the treaty or under any law of Congress; and I hope the Senator agrees with me that Mr. Boyden should come home, with all his entourage, and that the troops should be recalled from the Rhine speedily.

Mr. BORAH. With the latter proposition, as to the troops, I might well agree; but in view of the fact that we ratified the German treaty and claimed all the rights under the Versailles treaty which had been accredited to the United States by reason of the Versailles treaty, I do not believe that there is anything improper, we having ratified that treaty, in our claiming whatever that treaty gives us. It was agreed to as a matter of treaty. It is an obligation of the German Government, and there is no reason why the German Government should not pay our representatives there just the same as they pay the others. But, Mr. President, what I do object to—if I can find a term which will express my own feeling without being offensive to somebody else—is this maintaining that Mr. Boyden is there as a mere "observer." He is there performing exactly the same duties which would be devolving upon him if he had taken the oath of office and were recognized as a member of the commission.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I agree wholly with the Senator from Idaho that Mr. Boyden's presence in Paris and his functioning there, under whatever pretext, is, if I may use the language of the stonecutter mayor of Concord, N. H., a "subterfuge," and I hope we may put an end to it.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I should like to ask either of the Senators just what are the functions of our representative on the Reparation Commission. Does he vote upon the commission, or does he simply counsel and advise the commission?

Mr. BORAH. Technically, I think he does not vote, for the simple reason that it has not been thought safe yet to undertake to have an act of Congress passed, but I want to say to you that I believe that anyone who will take pains to ascertain what Mr. Boyden is doing—and he is a very able, very eminent lawyer; no possible criticism can be lodged against him individually—if you will take pains to find out what he is doing, or his assistants are doing, you will find that it is just the same in effect and result as if we had passed an act of Congress.

The President said yesterday that the treaty provided that an election should be had by Congress, and that the Congress had not passed any law providing for that election. Why, certainly, Mr. President; I knew that. I did not have to go to the State Department to find that out. I knew that we had not passed any act; but there is no contention, there is no assertion—I venture to predict that there will not be—that while the act has not been passed, Mr. Boyden is not in effect discharging all the duties of a member of that commission.

Mr. STERLING. Oh, Mr. President, how can that be if the commission has certain things to decide, and to decide by vote—the vote of the members of the commission?

Mr. BORAH. It does not have to decide them by vote.

Mr. STERLING. I should think it would have to decide them by vote.

Mr. BORAH. No; it does not have to decide them by vote. I am informed that once in a while the members have come to a vote on matters. They decide them by discussion and coun-

sel and finally an agreement upon these matters; and that is always true, I understand, when the United States is directly interested.

Mr. STERLING. My idea was that he had about the same function that a Delegate from a Territory of the United States had in the House of Representatives. He was there to influence, so far as he might be able to influence, by speech, perhaps by work upon committees, but without a vote. He could not do the one essential thing—commit his Territory or constituents by a vote.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator says he is there to influence. Influence whom? Why, influence the man who technically casts the vote. What is the difference, if he is there to exert his influence, if somebody else mechanically puts the vote in the ballot box?

Mr. STERLING. What is the difference in the House of Representatives when a Delegate from a Territory, for instance, may speak?

Mr. BORAH. The difference is that a Delegate from a Territory has no influence.

Mr. STERLING. He has no influence, so far as that is concerned, when it comes to the record and voting.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. MOSES. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senator from Idaho to paragraph 13 of Annex 2, Part VIII, the reparation section of the treaty of Versailles, which reads:

When a decision of the commission is taken the votes of all the delegates entitled to vote, or, in the absence of any of them, of their assistant delegates, shall be recorded.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely.

Mr. MOSES. I take that to mean that any decision of the commission has to be reached by vote.

Mr. BORAH. I take it that it does not mean that. If it does, it is not observed. But suppose that they did have to take a vote. Suppose that the actual vote technically was to be recorded; but here sits Mr. Boyden, representing 110,000,000 people, the United States, the most powerful Nation by reason of our independent position connected with the commission, and, as the Senator from South Dakota says, he is there to influence by his argument and by his counsel, but he is there to influence infinitely more by the fact that thus and so the United States would like to see this happen. Now, what is the difference?

Mr. STERLING. Oh, Mr. President, I think there is quite a difference. If it comes to a vote, and if they do decide by a vote of the members of the Reparation Commission, he is outside of that vote, and can not by his vote determine anything.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, suppose that the representative of the United States on the Reparation Commission, sitting there as an observer, should exercise his influence and bring about a certain result by reason of his argument and his influence. Suppose that they should yield to his argument and his influence: Would we not be bound as a nation, by every conceivable rule of morals, to maintain that result? And when they went to Berlin a few days ago or a few weeks ago for the purpose to trying to adjust finally the question of the amount of reparations, did you observe the part—the prominent part, the leading part, the influential part—which Mr. Boyden took in trying to arrive at a conclusion? And if they had arrived at a conclusion by reason of his influence, can it be argued here in seriousness that we were not in precisely the same position, so far as results are concerned, as if he had voted?

Mr. President, that is a technical proposition on which I have spent entirely too much time. I was only calling attention to it to indicate the real attitude which we have now with reference to these European affairs; and there is not one of them of any moment or concern to the people of Europe, or indirectly of concern to the people of the United States, wherein we are not represented. I do not say that we vote. Ambassadors do not determine things by votes; but we are there represented, influencing and counseling certain courses and the adoption of certain policies.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And giving certain warnings.

Mr. BORAH. Yes. My able friend from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] has just called attention to the fact that there was no vote when they formed the treaty of Versailles. Does the Senator think there was any vote when they formed the treaties down here with reference to disarmament?

Mr. STERLING. There was an agreement reached in some way. Whether it was by direct vote or not, there was an agreement there upon the part of the parties who represented their several Governments, and who attested that agreement by sign-

ing a certain treaty which came up here for ratification afterwards.

Mr. BORAH. Suppose that the members of the Reparation Commission should agree upon a policy, and our member should not agree with them, and after having argued with them and convinced them and influenced them they agree with him, would we not be bound just the same as if he had gone through the perfectly useless form of casting a vote?

Mr. STERLING. I think, with reference to that, something would depend upon the instructions given our representative on the Reparation Commission. But it is understood he is there as an observer. I understand that is the capacity in which he acts.

Take Ambassador Child at Lausanne: He is there as an observer. Now, what authority has he to commit his country to any proposition or to any policy when acting in that capacity? He is there to warn, perhaps, against any action upon the part of the conference that would be inimical to the United States or to its interests. Beyond that he would exceed his instructions, and this Government would not be legally or morally bound by his action.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if there is anything that is bringing humiliation and disgrace to the American Government right now, it is the fact that whenever a conference is called in Europe we snoop around and look in upon the proposition and report back to the people of the United States that we simply observed what happened. I can not imagine anything more humiliating to a great country than undertaking to influence situations in just that way.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I did not mean to put it quite in that light, namely, that he was there simply to look on, and I mentioned the fact that he probably would warn other Governments or warn the conferees against any action that would be contrary to the interests of the United States. That is the capacity in which he acts, and I think that is about the extent of his authority.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; here is the able Senator from South Dakota, the trained and veteran lawyer, and after his defense of Mr. Boyden and his position, if he were on trial for murder upon the same argument he would be convicted without the jury ever leaving the box.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNARY in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator recall the colloquy yesterday, or a day or two ago, when the question of the instructions given to our representative there by our State Department was before the Senate? The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LONG] denied that our representative was there to volunteer his opinions or to make arguments, but that he was there like a small boy, to speak when he was spoken to and answer questions when they were put to him.

Mr. BORAH. I think we may pass from this subject now. We all are agreed upon one thing, and that is that he is there.

Mr. STERLING. Oh, yes; we agree that he is there.

Mr. BORAH. I want to say just a word in conclusion, and I will not trespass upon the Senate longer. The President's letter of yesterday perhaps might be regarded by many as sufficient justification for me withdrawing this amendment. Of course, I desire to speak with the utmost respect with reference to the letter, and I only mention it at all to enable me to state my position.

As I understand the President's letter, it is not his purpose to act in this matter until there is an indication upon the part of the nations of Europe that they desire that action shall be taken. His letter pretty plainly states that proposition. That is a disagreement upon a fundamental proposition. It is not a mere matter of form; it is a matter of difference which goes to the very heart of this entire movement.

If we are to wait until the nations of Europe get together and send us word that they have agreed to disarm, there will be very little occasion for calling any conference at all; but I do not believe that in the present condition of affairs that is likely to happen until much worse conditions happen in this country than now obtain. I speak, therefore, with the utmost respect for the Chief Magistrate when I say that is a matter of disagreement upon a fundamental proposition underlying this entire proposition. I do not believe that we can wait longer upon Europe.

I believe we are in the position Colonel Roosevelt was in with reference to the Russo-Japanese war or with reference to the Algeiras situation, and that we have been in with ref-

erence to many conditions which have confronted us, and we ought ourselves to take the leadership in regard to this subject. I do not think it is possible to adopt the course which the President suggests without serious detriment to the American people. About that there is, therefore, that difference of opinion.

I am not quoting his language, of course, but he further says that any foreign policy which now obtains is in the keeping of the Secretary of State, and that it would have been more seemly had the Senator from Massachusetts—I suppose he meant the Senator from Massachusetts, because he wrote the letter to him—had the Senator from Massachusetts visited the State Department and found out what those policies were. I do not assume that that letter was addressed or directed to anyone else than the receiver of it. It might have been misdirected.

Mr. President, there was no occasion for me to go to the State Department to find out what the policy was with reference to this situation, because it was very well understood what it was. It was stated from day to day upon high authority, coming from the State Department, which, of course, always means official authority, thus and so, that "We do not propose to do this and we do not propose to do that," and that "We are undertaking nothing of this kind and nothing of that kind." I anticipated that which the President states in his letter, that it was not the purpose of the State Department or of the administration to move until the Governments of Europe moved.

If that be true, then there is such a wide breach that however many visits I might have made to the genial Secretary of State undoubtedly no result would have happened. I trust that I shall always have the privilege of visiting the Secretary of State whenever it seems necessary to acquire information, and for him individually I have the very highest regard. Personally, he is recognized as a great lawyer and a great statesman, and I am not here to criticize him.

Mr. President, the time will never come when I shall desire to offer a resolution in this body, or when I shall desire to introduce a bill, or when I shall desire to express my view that I shall feel under the necessity of asking the permission of anyone to discharge the duty which seems to me to devolve upon me here as a Senator. If I make a mistake, if I am in error as to any course, I settle it with my constituency, which is the only tribunal before which it can be properly adjusted, and in saying this I offer no disrespect either to the President or to the Secretary of State, but I am simply stating my conception of the duty of a Senator.

I do not understand that the relationship of the Senate to foreign affairs is such that a Senator must not have any views upon a foreign question until he receives his information and his permission to have views from the Executive or the Secretary of State. That is not the constitutional relationship which exists.

Now, as I said in the beginning, if there is no occasion for this conference, if the situation is not one which calls for a conference, if the situation is not one which calls for treatment, there is no reason in the world why this amendment should prevail. On the other hand, if the situation is such that we must deal with it, then I am a firm believer in the proposition that the power of public opinion ought to operate upon this situation.

I would not detract or take away from the Secretary of State in the slightest his power to deal with the situation, even if I could; I would not hamper it or embarrass it in the least; but I do believe that the power of public opinion has a function to perform, just as it did have in reference to disarmament, and without which power of public opinion disarmament could not have been effected.

Mr. President, this situation is far more serious than it seems to be conceded in this debate. Each day the trouble seems to deepen and the menace seems to come nearer and nearer. What may it all mean? It is not many weeks since we celebrated the fourth anniversary of the signing of the armistice—in some respects the most important event since the beginning of the Christian era. I thought I saw in the last celebration a lack of fervor. There was an atmosphere of jaded formality, if not of doubt and anxiety. There seemed to be an unexpressed feeling that the whole thing was untrue, in that there was nothing to celebrate. At the very time of the celebration the war clouds lowered upon the Near East. The formal phrases of the celebration were lost in the accustomed patois of premiers and diplomats speaking in almost indifferent terms of another great conflict. A tremor of dread shot with searching swiftness from corner to corner of a wounded, broken, and

almost bankrupt world. The situation is only a little more hopeful now. Indeed, at no time during the last four years have the people of the world been free from the tormenting apprehension of another frightful sacrifice. The whole human family, scarred and tortured, prays for peace; and yet there is no peace. When shall we cease to live in this atmosphere of war? When shall we escape from the spell of war? When shall we loosen the grip of the monster? This is the most stupendous problem in the world to-day. Beside this question all other questions are subsidiary and incidental. Without a solution, and a favorable solution, of this riddle, human progress becomes a misfortune, the inventions of the human mind a curse, and civilization, so called, an alluring trap into which men and women are ensnared to a death of unspeakable torture.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I share in the anxiety of the able and eloquent Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], which he has so beautifully expressed, for a financial restoration of Europe. No man can turn a deaf ear to the cries which come from that continent, and in common with him, in common with every Member of this body, in common with our whole citizenship, in common with every lover of his race, I long earnestly for the early and complete rehabilitation of that war-torn land.

If I could bring myself to believe that the amendment proposed by the honorable Senator would conduce to that desired end, most happily would I give it my support; but being convinced, as I am, that its enactment would but clutter up the entire affair, and that it would retard and not advance the cause he seeks to aid, when it is put upon its passage my vote will be recorded in the negative.

Sensors, if the amendment proposed by the honorable Senator is in harmony with the plans and purposes of the administration, we do not need it. If, on the contrary, it runs counter to those plans or purposes, or in any wise interferes with them, we do not want it, for by its passage we would harm and not help the very cause we are all anxious to aid.

The able Senator who has proposed the amendment admits—and as to the proposition there is no dispute—that this primarily is an executive function. Of course, nobody presumes to say that a Senator has no right to introduce a resolution looking to the calling of a conference, but, at the same time, power to initiate negotiations, in so far as they affect our international relations, is executive. Inasmuch as that is an undisputed proposition, inasmuch as we know that the President is already exercising that right, and inasmuch as the honorable Senator in his speech the other day practically asserted that if his amendment interfered with the plans of the administration in this regard, he would at least give the matter most earnest consideration, I believe that the Senator, as he stated but a moment ago, should withdraw the amendment.

What was the language of the Senator?

It is interesting, however, to know that negotiations are now in progress dealing with the specific subject with which we are now concerned here as a Senate, and if we can be advised that the action of the United States Senate in approving of the dealing with this subject will conflict with or embarrass the program which is now under way, I shall be very glad indeed also to consider that in the disposition of this matter.

Mr. President, who is the best judge of the fact as to whether or not the amendment proposed by the Senator does embarrass the Chief Executive? Manifestly the Chief Executive himself.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I would concede that; but does the Senator state to me that the negotiations are now under way to accomplish the same thing sought to be accomplished by the amendment?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I shall answer the Senator in my way. The letter of the President read to us on the 28th instant contained this clause:

Such inquiry would have revealed the futility of any conference called until it is understood that such a conference would be welcomed by the nations concerned within the limits of discussion which the express will of Congress compels this Government to impose.

The Senator from Idaho has construed that to mean that the Secretary of State or our administration should take no action whatever in the matter until European countries shall have requested them to do so. I submit, and especially in the light of what we know to be going on, that that is not the correct interpretation of the clause. What does it say:

Until such a conference would be welcomed by the nations concerned.

In other words, until feelers should be put out, as we ordinarily express it, for the purpose of finding out whether or not such a conference would be welcomed by those people; and I go so far as to say that that has been done, and that the things that have been undertaken may, if successfully continued, go so far as to result in the holding of a conference in the future.

The President of the United States does not need to be goaded by legislative action into calling a conference on the limitation

of armaments. It will be recalled that in his speech accepting the nomination on the 22d day of July, 1920, he uttered this now famous statement:

I can hear in the call of conscience an insistent voice for largely reduced armaments throughout the world, with attending reduction of burdens upon peace-loving humanity. We wish to give the American influence an example. We must give the American leadership to that invaluable accomplishment.

This sentiment was reechoed in his inaugural address and resulted in the calling of the Limitation of Armament Conference, which I submit marked an epoch in the progressive march of civilization. I am not here to detract from the labor and the work of the honorable Senator from Idaho in that connection; but we all know that the limitation of armaments was in the mind of the President, as is evidenced by the address quoted and by his inaugural address and by many utterances of like character before and since the calling of that conference.

So the President of the United States does not need to be prodded by any legislative enactment into calling a conference for a reduction of the armaments of the world.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. WATSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. As the Senator has referred to the conference in Washington, it will be remembered that there was a resolution passed at that time somewhat similar to the amendment now pending. Did any harm come either to the Congress or to the President or to the American people or to the peoples of the world because the Senate passed that resolution?

Mr. WATSON. Not the slightest. No harm came, but conditions were different then from what they are now, and the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Idaho at that time was on a specific proposition. He now offers an amendment to the naval appropriation bill, as wide as human language can frame it, to the effect that a conference shall be called, the object of which shall be to deal with the economic and financial conditions of the whole world, to see whether or not trade can be resumed and normal conditions of prosperity restored. Conditions then and conditions now differ. Not only that, but there was a specific statement as to the object of that conference. Even then, I am free to say, with all due deference to my honorable friend, the conference of a year ago, which resulted so splendidly to the world, was not called pursuant to the resolution introduced by the honorable Senator from Idaho, but on the initiative of the President of the United States himself. Not alone that, Senators, but it will be recalled that in many addresses since the adjournment of that conference the President of the United States has gone so far as to say that that was but the first step in the direction of further disarmament. Why, then, should any measure be passed by the Senate of the United States or by the Congress insisting upon the President now at this time calling another conference for the limitation of armament by the nations of the world?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. WATSON. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. How can the President call the disarmament conference without action upon the part of the Senate under the provision of the statute which was cited to me the other day to the effect that he is prohibited from so doing?

Mr. WATSON. Let me ask the Senator a question by way of answer. I know the Senator will be frank with me. When he introduced the other resolution and when he introduced the pending amendment did he have that enactment in mind and did he introduce the previous resolution and the pending amendment for the purpose of conferring that power upon the President?

Mr. BORAH. No; I did not; but the argument has been advanced by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and others that the President could not call this conference without violating the statute until he was authorized by Congress to do it. Does the Senator take that position, or has that argument disappeared?

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATSON. I have my own answer to that, but I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KELLOGG. Is it not a fact the President has the constitutional power to negotiate treaties and to call conferences for the purpose of negotiating treaties, and that Congress can not take away that power?

Mr. BORAH. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota precisely. I think the statute is ridiculous. Who authorized Mr. Wilson to go to the peace conference in Paris?

Mr. WATSON. Nobody.

Mr. BORAH. Who authorized the Secretary of State to call the conference which is now being held here? I merely desired to record the fact that that argument had disappeared.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WATSON. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Idaho could not properly interpret, from anything I have said in this debate, that I believed that the statute read by me was binding upon the President of the United States upon any matter within his presidential power.

Mr. WATSON. No; and nobody knows that better than my able friend from Idaho, because while on his feet he stated that he doubted very seriously whether or not that statute would stand the test, and we all know that it is an interference with the treaty-making power vested in the President by the Constitution.

Mr. BORAH. I agree with the Senator and I am still bewildered to know why the statute was read in this debate.

Mr. WATSON. Because the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] called attention to it.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Connecticut is one of the best lawyers in the Senate.

Mr. WATSON. I know he is, but I do not think he called attention to it with the idea of getting the Senator to agree that the President of the United States had no power to act, no power to initiate negotiations, no power to help formulate a treaty, simply because of the enactment of that provision on an appropriation bill.

Mr. LENROOT. May I suggest that that statute will have some bearing upon this proceeding which I think will develop later, but I certainly never took the position for a moment that the President of the United States was bound by it in relation to such a conference as is now proposed.

Mr. BORAH. I shall await with some curiosity to know what relationship it is to have.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator will find out.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I repeat that inasmuch as the right to initiate negotiations for the formulation of a treaty or for the calling of a conference of this character or for the determination of any of our international relations is an executive function, inasmuch as it is clearly not a legislative function, inasmuch as the President is already exercising that power, inasmuch as he has said the passage of it would interfere with these proceedings, and inasmuch as the honorable Senator from Idaho has said that if it does interfere with or embarrass the action of the President in this regard he would at least take it into kindly consideration, I believe that we are warranted in asking the Senator to withdraw the amendment, and, if he shall not see fit to grant that request, that we are warranted in voting it down by an overwhelming majority.

In the next place, Senators, the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], in the speech just made, paid much attention to a portion of the argument of the eloquent Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] that he did not make, answering a position or overthrowing a position he did not assume. The Senator from California did not say that no conference should be held. He did not take the position that we should not endeavor in conference to settle these questions. What he aimed his shafts at was the idea that the mere calling of a conference would dispel the clouds that hover above us, that the mere calling of a conference would settle all of our ills and provide a panacea for all the woes that so seriously beset us. In that contention I quite agree with the argument of the Senator from California.

Mr. President, speaking for myself, I am in favor of such a conference, but I am in favor of having its powers clearly defined, of a well-worked-out program, of definite agenda, so that when the conference shall come together it shall work in accordance with a fixed program and along lines definitely laid out.

Let us look back to the conference that occurred in Washington one year ago. Suppose that, pursuant to the resolution passed by the Senate, the one introduced by the honorable Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], a conference representing the various powers concerned had been called together without any previous arrangement, without any formulated program, without a fixed and definite agenda upon which it was to act. Does anybody suppose it would have eventuated as happily as it did? Senators, that was all worked out in advance. It was all prearranged. It was all understood before the gathering of the conferees in this city, and when they did come together the Secretary of State, with a boldness that attracted and with a frankness that compelled support announced the already agreed-on program, agreed on at least by a portion of those who were represented at that conference, and with the announcement of that program success was assured.

Does anybody believe that a conference should be called without any prearrangement, without any formulated program, without any definitely defined agenda, without anything being done for the purpose of determining what the conference is to consider, how far we shall be asked to go, and how far other nations are willing to go?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. WATSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. It is true, as I recall, that before the conference began its work there was a certain definite, defined agenda prepared. But is it not also true that the four-power pact grew out of that conference and was not even in contemplation when the conference was first convened? Does not that demonstrate also that some good may come out of this conference if it is called?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. WATSON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, the question of the four-power pact was of course covered by questions of the Far East which the President added to the matter of disarmament. If the Senator will allow me further—

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. I will say while I am on my feet that of course no nation would invite other nations to an important conference without first being assured that the invitation would be accepted. No nation wishes to encounter rejection when it performs such a serious act as to invite other nations to a conference. It is always usual to sound the other nations in order to find out whether any of them will come and who are ready to come. The general purposes of the conference are, of course, then outlined in the informal conversations, which can hardly be dignified with the name "negotiations."

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, do I understand from what the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has just said that there were any informal or other conferences or negotiations or correspondence relative to the four-power pact before the conference was convened?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the four-power pact was simply the method of disposing of the subjects which had been laid before the other powers. They were not asked, "Will you adopt this treaty" or "Will you adopt the Chinese tariff treaty?" They were asked if they were ready to come into a conference and consider questions relating to China and the Far East.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, during the early part of that conference I confess that I was with a committee of the Senate in Haiti and Santo Domingo, and therefore I can not speak by the book, but I remember very distinctly that when I returned home one of the contentions in the newspapers was to the effect that that four-power pact was not in contemplation at the time the conference was called.

Mr. LODGE. All the questions relating to the Far East were in contemplation; and, as a matter of fact, the question of the Anglo-Japanese alliance had been in discussion between the powers for several months, and it was probably better understood than any other outstanding question which was brought before the conference.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Before the Senator from Indiana proceeds may I ask a question?

Mr. WATSON. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I understood the Senator from Indiana to request the Senator from Idaho to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. WATSON. No; I did not request the Senator to do that, but I suggested that it would be entirely proper for him to do so.

Mr. BORAH. It will be proper if I may have an understanding with the Senator from Indiana. Do I understand the Senator to say that he can now state, and does state, as he said a moment ago, that negotiations are now in progress for the purpose of calling a conference?

Mr. WATSON. No; not negotiations. What I said was that feelers had been put out; that foreign nations were being sounded with a view to finding out whether the United States may be helpful, and that, in my opinion, they might lead to a conference; but I have no authority whatever to say that. I speak purely for myself as an individual, and give my personal views, representing the opinions of nobody in authority. At the same time, I am not entirely ignorant of the fact that feelers have been put out, just as the President in his letter states.

Mr. BORAH. I do not want to know the details.

Mr. WATSON. I do not know the details.

Mr. BORAH. I do not desire to know the details.

Mr. WATSON. If I knew the details, I would tell the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly; but what I do want to know, because I am now dealing in good faith in this matter, is this: The Senator has said that negotiations—

Mr. WATSON. No; not negotiations.

Mr. BORAH. Well, perhaps the proceedings have not ripened into negotiations.

Mr. WATSON. Not by any means.

Mr. BORAH. But feelers.

Mr. LODGE. Conversations.

Mr. BORAH. Conversations.

Mr. WATSON. Conversations is the diplomatic term.

Mr. BORAH. "Conversations across the sea." I understood the Senator to say that conversations or feelers had been put out looking to ascertaining whether or not the United States could be helpful in adjusting the condition of affairs in Europe, and that the Senator's opinion was that ultimately they would lead to a conference covering the question of economic conditions.

Mr. WATSON. Or to some gathering for the purpose of determining the problems. That is the opinion which I have expressed.

Mr. BORAH. But the Senator does know that the feelers have been put out?

Mr. WATSON. That is my understanding.

Mr. BORAH. And that they have for their ultimate object adjusting the conditions which now prevail in Europe.

Mr. WATSON. To aid in such adjustment.

Mr. BORAH. Yes. The Senator further states that it is the opinion of the Executive that if this amendment shall be adopted it will embarrass the due progress of those feelers?

Mr. WATSON. I only know what the President's letter states; I have not discussed the matter with him.

Mr. BORAH. But that is the interpretation which the Senator from Indiana puts on the letter?

Mr. WATSON. That is the interpretation which I put on the letter.

Mr. BORAH. If that is true, I am willing to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. WATSON. I shall be very happy to have the Senator from Idaho withdraw the amendment, but it has not as yet been offered.

Mr. BORAH. If those who are opposing the amendment do not wish me to withdraw it, if the situation is not as has been understood—

Mr. WATSON. I state my views and my opinion from what I know concerning the situation. I am not here to say that the President has started out to call a conference, such a conference as the Senator from Idaho proposes in his amendment. I am here to say, however, that for the last two or three months feelers have been put out for the purpose of ascertaining the situation and just how far we could go, how far we might be asked to go, and how far other nations would be willing to go in the adjustment of the situation. I do not know to what length that process has gone; I have never said a word to the Secretary of State about it, nor has he to me. I draw my own conclusions from some things that I know.

Mr. BORAH. But the Senator from Indiana does know that those feelers have been put out?

Mr. WATSON. That is my understanding.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Will the Senator from Indiana permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. WATSON. I will.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Is it not a matter of public record in the newspapers that conversations have been continued for three months looking to a conference at Brussels, always provided that the powers which presumably would sit in conference at Brussels have some basis of agreement upon which they could proceed?

Mr. WATSON. I have so understood.

Mr. MCCORMICK. And that failing such a basis until now the conference at Brussels has been postponed from time to time.

Mr. WATSON. For what other purpose would Colonel Harvey have been called home but to discuss the situation and to enable the administration to ascertain conditions in England, and on the Continent as well?

Mr. BORAH. We can deal with this matter in a candid way. I do not pay any attention to what the newspapers say about it on one day, because the next day upon high authority their statements are always denied. So I do not know. I have very great respect for the newspapers, but, of course, they have only

one source of information in regard to the matter, and that is "high authority."

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Idaho will permit a very humble authority to answer him, I know that such conversations have been carried on.

Mr. BORAH. For what purpose?

Mr. McCORMICK. To the end that a conference may sit in Brussels to consider economic problems.

Mr. BORAH. And that we are to be a part of that conference?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I will ask the Senator from Missouri to wait for just a moment—and that we are to be a part of that conference?

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, let me repeat I know that conversations have been carried on to the end that a conference may be held in Brussels and that the suggestion may be made to this Government that it may sit at Brussels.

Mr. BORAH. Oh! What a privilege it must be to have somebody suggest that we may sit at Brussels. However, does the Senator understand that conversations have been held by our Government with the view that we are to participate in a conference at Brussels?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think a great deal of complexity has been made out of a very simple subject. I understand that our Government in the usual way, through its ambassadors and ministers abroad, has been making inquiries, holding what are technically called conversations, informal conversations, with a view to ascertaining on the part of this Government whether there was anything it could properly do to improve financial conditions in Europe.

Mr. BORAH. Economic conditions?

Mr. LODGE. Economic conditions.

Mr. WATSON. Economic conditions.

Mr. LODGE. Those conversations have been going on for some time through the usual channels, those channels being the ambassadors and ministers of the United States, and such information as may be derived from them always goes to the State Department. I have not inquired what point has been reached; I only know, as a matter of fact, that the effort has been made to ascertain through those channels whether there is anything this Government could properly do to aid in the reestablishment of economic conditions and business stability in Europe.

Mr. BORAH. And the Senator is of the opinion that if the amendment I have offered should be adopted it would embarrass negotiations?

Mr. LODGE. I think it would be harmful; yes.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, on the statements of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and of the Senators from Indiana and Illinois I am willing to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I should like to have a little further understanding about this mystery. I can see no earthly sense in making so much of a mystery of it. We have spent about 10 days debating the amendment. Finally we were told by the President in a letter that there was something going on and that we could all find out what it is if we would agree not to tell anybody, which, of course, implies that we could not make use of the information, except we could go to bed with it and be very careful not to talk in our sleep. I do not know any more now than I did before the Senator from Massachusetts spoke, and he spoke more directly than any other Senator on the question. We know now that something has been said about some kind of a conference that shall have something to do with economic conditions, but that does not give a man any information on which he may act. If the kind of conference which the Senator from Idaho has in contemplation is to be held and it is either to be held in Brussels or in Washington, I should prefer having it held in Washington, for I think we could keep a little better track of our delegates here than we could over in Brussels.

Mr. CARAWAY. We were not able to do that with reference to our delegates in Washington who framed the four-power pact.

Mr. REED of Missouri. No; but God knows what would have happened if they had met on the other side of the ocean.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, how much longer does my friend from Missouri want to occupy my time?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not know he had the floor. When I came in there were five Senators on the floor. They all, including the Senator from Indiana, sat down, and I thought that he had yielded the floor.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, my amendment seems to be much more popular than I thought it was. I can not get it out of the Senate now.

Mr. WATSON. I am entirely willing for the Senator to say that he will not offer the amendment on the statements made by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BORAH. On the statement made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] and the statement made by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] and the statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] I am perfectly willing to decline to offer the amendment.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I wish to apologize to the Senator from Indiana. I had been out of the Chamber for a moment and I thought he had sat down. Of course, the situation is interesting, because I understand the Senator from Idaho is withdrawing his amendment on suspicion. Now, there may be something going on; I should like to know what it is before the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Idaho says that he will not offer the amendment, I imagine the only thing to do is to go on and vote on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. REED of Missouri. Why did the Senator from Indiana want to take me off of my feet? Was it merely because he did not want me to speak?

Mr. WATSON. The Senator knows that I always listen to him with extreme pleasure, but I intended to conclude my remarks if the Senator from Idaho had not withdrawn his amendment. He having withdrawn the amendment, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the only regret about it is that I always like to hear the Senator from Indiana speak; but do I understand now that the last clause of the bill is also to be rejected? That calls for a conference.

Mr. LODGE. No.

Mr. BORAH. What does it call for?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; only an invitation to the four powers that signed the naval treaty with us to meet again and consider the question of putting limitations on auxiliary craft.

Mr. BORAH. That is to stand?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know whether it is to stand or not.

Mr. WATSON. That depends on each individual Member of the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. Very well. I am willing to proceed with the bill.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. As I understand, if the Senator will allow me—I have not the bill before me—I think it does not request a conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Indiana to yield the floor?

Mr. WATSON. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. LODGE. I do not understand that the House provision requests a conference—I think only a negotiation. I have not it before me.

Mr. WATSON. I can read it if the Senator desires.

Mr. LODGE. I shall be glad to have the Senator read it.

Mr. WATSON (reading)—

The President is requested to enter into negotiations with the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan with the view of reaching an understanding or agreement relative to limiting the construction of all types and sizes of subsurface and surface craft of 10,000 tons standard displacement or less, and of aircraft.

It is merely to enter into negotiations.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; that is all.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that no amendment is proposed to that by the committee. This is the House provision, to which there is no amendment proposed.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; certainly it is a House provision, but the Senate can strike it out.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, when the Senator from Indiana claimed the floor I had reached within about one sentence of concluding all I then wanted to say. But in view of what has just transpired I want to submit some additional remarks.

I think it is about time to quit this policy of secrecy and mystery regarding what our Government is doing. I want to speak just a moment very plainly about it.

A man who is elected President from this Senate floor does not know a bit more the moment after he is elected than he did before he was elected. He is the same man in a different

job. His wisdom is not increased a particle. A man who is taken from the bar or the bench of the country and put in the office of Secretary of State does not know a bit more the moment after than he did the moment before he was confirmed by the Senate. The men who are taken from various business vocations or professions and sent to foreign governments do not possess any more wisdom immediately after appointment than immediately before.

There is not one of them whose opinion upon a great matter would have been accepted as a finality the day before he got into office. Why should he be regarded as infallible the moment he is elected or appointed? I am unwilling that the great business of the country shall be disposed of behind veils and curtains when that business has relation to matters of great general public concern and about which there is no necessity of mystery.

I can conceive that a question might arise of such delicacy that for a few days or a few hours it is necessary the negotiations should be carried on without advising the whole world. But a question such as is involved here is a matter of general public concern, and no good reason can be given for all this mystery and secrecy and whispering.

What is the question? It relates to the economic condition of the world. That is public property. Part of that question is, What are the demands of the other nations? That is largely public property. If this Government has any suggestion to make to France touching the loosening of her grip of steel upon the economic and political throat of Germany, would it not be a good thing to say so frankly, and let the weight of the world's opinion be thrown into the balance? Of course, if a conspiracy is being formed to pledge the financial support of the United States or to cancel our foreign debts, there is abundant reason for secrecy, because no man dare accept the responsibility of such a proposition until by skillful propaganda the public mind shall be prepared to submit to the outrage.

A little more frankness in dealing with the Senate and the House of Representatives, a little greater recognition of the fact that Congress is in fact the chief part of this Government, would be a good thing.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, does the Senator mean that they are in fact or that they are in theory the chief part of this Government?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I mean in law.

Mr. FRANCE. In theory?

Mr. REED of Missouri. No; in law, under the Constitution.

What is the reason, when we are dealing with a foreign government, that the State Department has to put on velvet slippers and go about talking in whispers? Why can not the world be told what America's policy is? Or why can not the President say boldly, "I have asked the foreign nations what they will do, and when I have an answer from them I shall be glad to take the advice of Congress, if necessary"?

I regard the President's letter in which he lectured the Senate for daring to consider this amendment—for that is the import of the letter—as a piece of very bad taste. I remember that Jefferson, I think, in one of his inaugural addresses declared that he would find himself overburdened with the responsibilities of government except for the constant assistance of the representatives of the people.

I have listened to this debate with a great deal of care. It has been conducted along high lines. I think, however, some statements have been made in this debate that are mistakes of fact and that correction is demanded.

To begin with, Mr. President, the statement that the world is going to ruin and that civilization is about to perish is wild exaggeration. I have heard that same statement on other occasions. There is no sense in making it, for it is not true.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator just a minute?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. Take, for instance, the condition in Austria. The secretary to the President of Austria, whose name I can not now recall, but Senators here on the floor, I am sure, will remember it, in speaking of the conditions in Austria, showed me a house that he owns in Vienna that he rents which before the war brought him the equivalent of \$4,000 a year in American money. The same house now rents for 40 cents a year.

Mr. André, who is the head of transportation in Austria—he was under the old empire, and still is—told me that the highest-paid man on the Austrian railway to-day, an engineer who pulls the best passenger train, gets a salary equivalent to \$87 a year in American money. The street car conductors get \$2 a month. Oh, the Senator from Utah drags in the tariff.

He is perfectly willing, if they can get a tariff on sugar in Utah, that the rest of the world shall starve. He will be fat on sugar. A lady working in a store or a stenographer in Vienna or in Berlin will get from two to five and some of them as high as eight dollars a month. As to the cost of living, I see sitting over on the other side of the Chamber a Senator who, with me, rented a room in Vienna, and we paid for each night's rental of that room 250,000 kronen.

If the Senator thinks that that sort of an economic condition is merely normal, and that nothing bad can come out of it, when all the agricultural products of that country will feed the people two months and no longer, and if you can buy something outside with that sort of currency, I am curious to know it. I bought for \$20, 1,500,000 kronen. I got cheated out of 15,700 kronen because I did not look at the exchange rate that day. Now, those are the conditions.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator—and nobody has kindler feelings for the Senator than myself; nobody more than myself recognizes his intellectual acumen—the statement he has just made absolutely illustrates the point I am making. I say we have been indulging in loose statements. My statement was that it was ridiculous to argue that civilization was about to perish, whereupon the Senator proceeds to demonstrate that civilization is about to perish from the earth from the fact that rents have fallen in Austria.

Mr. CARAWAY. If the Senator from Missouri will read his remarks, if I may interrupt the Senator again—

Mr. REED of Missouri. I quoted them accurately.

Mr. CARAWAY. If the Senator will read his remarks, he will find that he was talking about the economic conditions, that the world was not going to wreck.

Mr. REED of Missouri. No; I did not say that. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. CARAWAY. When the Senator reads his remarks, he will find he did state that.

Mr. REED of Missouri. We will let them stand just as they are.

Mr. CARAWAY. Very well.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I say that it is ridiculous to talk about civilization perishing. It is quite another thing to say—and I was coming to that—that there is financial difficulty in Europe of a serious character.

Another statement made is that there will be war in Europe, and that we will be drawn into it. Mr. President, it is conceivable there may be yet some feeling in Europe and Asia. My opinion is that they are likely to fight as long as they have the ability. The reason is that race hatreds and race prejudices that exist are found in the conflicts of 2,000 years. Those prejudices were stirred into activity by this great war. Peace will not finally come to those countries until compelled by exhaustion. Nevertheless, the statement that the United States will be drawn into those conflicts is about as groundless a bit of imagination as is conceivable. One hundred and six wars, big and little, were fought in Europe from 1812 to 1914, and we were not in one of them. In 1917 we were drawn into the war, not by the economic conditions of Europe but because one of the nations deliberately sank our vessels upon the high seas. We recited in our declaration of war that Germany had made war upon us.

Mr. President, Germany struck that blow at the commerce of the United States because she thought she dared to strike it, and she struck in her desperation. The German Government thought that the United States could not get over there. It thought that if we did get over we could not fight when we arrived. That was the opinion of many European people. No nation will repeat that mistake within the life of any man now living. They have found out that we can cross the ocean. They have learned that these "traders" of America, as they called us, are not very pleasant customers to deal with when they arrive on the battle front.

Let us seriously consider this question of war upon the United States. What nation is going to attack us? Suppose all Europe were aflame with war to-morrow. What European power would deliberately insult the United States of America and force her into that war? Would it be poor, prostrate, bleeding Germany? Would it be exhausted France? Would it be England? Would it be these allies of ours, for whose welfare your hearts are now bleeding? Are you asking us to sit down at the table with the same gentlemen who you say will cut our throats at the first opportunity?

What nonsense to talk about the United States being drawn into any European war. What nation is going to fight us? Where is our enemy? There is but one nation could seriously harm us. Do you really fear an attack by Great Britain? If

I understand the sentiment of the majority of this body, they regard Great Britain as our certain friend. Upon that there may be difference of opinion. I at least do not fear her.

Moreover, we meet with the same contradiction here that we have met many other times. In a breath we are told that Europe is starving, that she is exhausted, that unless we come to her aid with alms in our hands or benefactions in our arms she will perish. In the same breath we are warned that some European nation is coming over here, across 3,000 miles of ocean, in majestic and irresistible force, to conquer the United States. Is there any logic in that kind of argument? Is there any sense in that kind of statement? It may serve to alarm the public and it may be water on the wheel of the propagandists who want the United States to guarantee, in some form or other, by direction or indirection, the private bonds of the American investors across the ocean, but it should not find voice in this forum.

Mr. President, I call attention to another exaggerated statement, namely, that our farmers are going to perish. Right here is a good illustration of the wild statements being made. First it is asserted that Europe is about to perish for food, and the Senator who makes the statement almost in the same sentence declares that we are so impoverished that Bolshevism is about to sweep the country. He asserts that already in the Northwestern States civil government has substantially broken down for want of funds to carry it on. If such a statement is read across the water, the comment will be, "What a frightful condition exists in America." What a picture it will present to the people of the Old World. If the Senator was as badly mistaken about European conditions as he was about American conditions, then his judgment about European conditions is not of much value.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, my good friend the Senator from Missouri is evidently referring to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I appear to have accurately described the Senator's remarks, since he so readily applies the description.

Mr. FRANCE. I will say, in reply to the Senator from Missouri, that the Senator from Maryland took the pains to make a journey to Europe to ascertain what were the conditions.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Did the Senator take a trip to the Northwestern States?

Mr. FRANCE. The Senator spoke with reference to European conditions, from what he knew, as the Senator from Arkansas did.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator think he knows more about European affairs than he knows about the conditions in his own country?

Mr. FRANCE. I will also say that the Senator from Maryland has taken great interest in the agricultural problems of this country and has made a special investigation of the conditions in the Northwest, and if the Senator from Missouri will do the same he will find that my statements with reference to the conditions in the Northwest were not exaggerated.

The trouble with some Senators here is that they do not investigate for themselves, and when some one who has investigated brings to the Senate a statement of the facts as they really exist the other Senators are astonished, as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] seemed to be astonished yesterday when I stated the facts with reference to the food situation in Europe, facts which can be readily ascertained and readily confirmed by inquiries from the proper sources.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, this is a fitting example. The Senator lives away down here in Maryland, a fine State. He has been investigating the Northwest, and says he has found the conditions which I have referred to there exist. He is the only man in the United States who has found them. He says he has been to Europe, and therefore he knows about Europe. I wonder if in his few days' sojourn in Europe he obtained information more accurate than he has of the United States, where he has lived all of his life?

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I am not the only one who is familiar with the agricultural difficulties existing in the Northwest, and I would suggest to the Senator from Missouri that he read the testimony recently given before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and if the testimony given there is what I think it was, he will find, I believe, that the statements I made are substantially correct. The farmers of the Northwest are not able generally to meet their taxes, which was what I stated and which I think is a most unfortunate situation.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator now says that the evidence was that many farmers in the Northwest can not pay their taxes. But a few hours ago he said civil government had broken down and that Bolshevism was

about to march across the land. He thus illustrates the very vice about which I am complaining—that is, exaggeration, hyperbole, and wild assertion. It is one thing to say that civil government has broken down and that Bolshevism is rampant and quite another thing to say that some farmers can not pay their taxes this year. The latter statement is a fact. The former statement is balderdash.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri is evidently quoting some other Senator than the Senator from Maryland. I misinterpreted his allusion. The Senator from Maryland did not make any such statement as that the Government had completely broken down and that Bolshevism was sweeping the country.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I heard the Senator's speeches. I do not know how they appear in the Record; I suppose the Senator let them go in as they were made.

The fact about the matter is that our farmers have had a very hard time, that they are having a hard time now, and if we would make that statement, and deal with the matter in that form, we would be exhibiting some kind of judgment; but when we talk about the country going over to Bolshevism, intimate that anarchy is at our doors, and that civil government has broken down, that is an entirely different proposition. I am discussing the question of exaggeration and overstatement.

The truth is that, bad as the farm situation has been, it is getting better. I have heard it stated that our farmers were in the most desperate plight because Europe could not buy farm products, and that this calamity had fallen upon us because we did not go into the League of Nations, or because we failed to advance more money to Europe, or because we refused to accept the advice of certain international bankers and cancel our foreign loans. But the facts, as was shown by the figures which the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] put into the Record, and which were compiled by the Department of Commerce, are that we actually shipped over 50 per cent more of farm products, in dollars, to Europe in 1922 than we did in 1913.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, if the Senator does not object to my interrupting him, I want again to call attention to the fact that that increase of exports of foodstuffs was due to the desperate situation of Europe with reference to food; but the exports of other commodities have fallen off very greatly.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am discussing one question. I am discussing the exaggerated statement that our farmers have suffered from this condition, or are suffering from it, because we could not ship farm products to Europe. That is the one thing I am discussing, and that is the one thing I for the moment am going to discuss.

Mr. FRANCE. Nobody familiar with the figures has ever set up any such contention. The contention is made that because of the general economic situation the prices of farm products are now at a ruinous point, and to offset the increase of exports of foodstuffs to Europe, there has been a falling off in the consumption of foodstuffs in the United States, due to the depression of our industries, a falling off which is quite remarkable, indeed, one which almost strains the credulity; but the figures are such as I quoted yesterday.

Mr. REED of Missouri. There we are again! We can not keep anybody to any one point long enough to deal with that point. The statement has been made on the floor of the Senate many times in the last 60 days that our farmers were at the point of destruction because Europe could not buy any of our farm products. The cold fact is that we shipped to Europe of farm products in 1913, which is taken as a normal year, a total of \$1,145,469,137 worth of farm products, and that this year we shipped over \$1,930,000,000. I, of course, wish we had a better market. I am simply trying to answer one of these mistaken, wild, loose statements that have been made. Heaven knows I think the farmer needs a better market. I am willing to do anything I can to give it to him. But let us talk facts and not fancies, let us get the cobwebs out of our brains and some of the big words out of our mouths and describe things as they are.

Mr. President, there is another fact stated here—not a fact but a statement; a mistaken statement—that our people are eating less of farm products because they can not buy them. I make the assertion that wages are higher in the United States to-day than they have ever been in the history of the world unless it should happen to have been some particular peak time directly the result of the recent war. When we can not get a servant in Washington, a house servant or house employee, for less than \$75 or \$80 a month with room and board, when bricklayers get \$11, \$12, or \$13 a day, when we are building more houses in the United States to-day than at any period of its

history, when not only in Washington are the streets blocked with the brick and other building material, but likewise blocked in every city of the United States, when labor is in fact employed—not all of it, for there has always been a percentage of unemployed, but quite up to the average—what is the use of standing here and saying the people can not buy food and that therefore there is a surplus of our farm products going abroad?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOSES in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Corroborating what the Senator stated, I read a magazine article the other day written by a college professor—I assume it is correct in its facts—in which he deprecated the extent to which meat eating by the people of the United States had increased in the last year, and proved, if his figures are correct, that the consumption of meat products per capita to-day for food in the United States is greater by far than has ever been known in the whole history of the country.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not mean to say that things are ideal. I do not mean to say there are not men and women out of employment, and more out of employment than I would like to see. But that is a very different thing from saying that our people are so impoverished that they can not buy food, and that that condition exists to such an extent that we had to ship the food abroad because we could not find anybody here to eat it, and that they could not eat because they were so impoverished they could not buy.

Mr. FRANCE. That is the Senator's statement, not mine. My statement was that in 1920, when we had on an average 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 of men out of employment, a fact which was generally conceded, the consumption of wheat in this country fell off 250,000,000 bushels, as compared with the previous year. Those are the figures of the Department of Agriculture. I do not know whether they can be verified—I have no means of verifying them—but I am taking the figures of the Department of Agriculture. It is undoubtedly true, whether those figures are exactly accurate or not, that there was a great falling off in the consumption of wheat in 1920 during the hard times.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am talking about 1922 and about the statement that was made here that the principal reason why we sent agricultural products abroad in quantity this year, which is the year I talked about, and I have talked about no other year except 1913 for comparative purposes, was because the people could not buy them here. What is the use of talking about 1920, then? I have not been talking about it.

Mr. FRANCE. I was referring to 1921, as compared with 1920. There are no figures as to the consumption of wheat during 1922, inasmuch as those figures can only be compiled at the end of the year. But the Senator was questioning the fact that the falling off in the consumption of foodstuffs was so marked at periods of depression.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I was not questioning that at all. I was talking about 1922 shipments of our grains and farm products to Europe. The Senator then rose and proposed to explain why we have shipped those products, and the reason he gave was that the American people could not buy enough to eat, and hence they had to be shipped abroad. Now, if he made a mistake in the year, it is all right; but I did not make any mistake in the year.

Mr. President, what is happening? We are shipping abroad farm products, and the prices are not satisfactory in comparison with certain other very high prices, but the prices have been gradually coming up. I do not say the farmer has not the right to complain loudly and ask for all the proper assistance that can be rendered, and if a bill with that object in view is offered—a bill that is sound—I shall support it. But that is a very different thing, I repeat, from the declaration that the country is absolutely going to ruin.

Then, again, as I called to the attention of the Senate the other day, we are told in one breath that we are about to go to ruin, that we are tottering over the edge of the precipice of bankruptcy, and in the next breath we are told that we are rich enough to feed the world. There ought to be some sense and some consistency in the discussion of these questions. Neither of those statements is true. Neither are we on the edge of the precipice of bankruptcy nor are we able to feed the world. We are just about able to take care of ourselves in a decent manner. But if these dreamers, these purveyors of wild statements, steering the ship of state would not merely lose the true course, they would run it head on against the bald face of the ocean's granite walls. They would never know the wall

was there, or if they did, they would think they could transform the solid rocks into open waters by the mere power of their imaginings.

We are constantly lectured about our responsibility to Europe and our responsibility to humanity. We are told we are our brother's keeper.

Interpreted in plain English, that means that we must go over and tell the rest of the world how it shall live, how it shall conduct its business, and what kind of government it shall have. Are we "our brother's keeper"? Suppose our brother does not want us to "keep him"? There is not a single nation that wants us to be its keeper. Try even for an hour to be the keeper of the proud French people, you will find the agreeable and polite French people suddenly transformed into tigers that refuse to have a keeper. The French nation would not permit us to be "its keeper." The English nation does not want us or any other nation as its keeper. The last Englishman, from the blue-blooded aristocracy to the humblest cockney, would stand in the trench and drain his veins before he would permit us to be the keeper of England. The mistake that France is making to-day, and I say it boldly, is that she is trying to make herself too much the keeper of the German people.

It is one thing to collect an indemnity and to impose war conditions calculated to prevent a recurrence of war and it is quite another thing to drive a people to the point of desperation. If there is any grave danger to this world, any tremendous catastrophe lying in the near future, it will come from the fact that there may be created a condition in Germany where in their desperation that mighty people will hazard everything rather than endure extremity.

I pass from these exaggerations, of drawing false conclusions, to a review of some of the facts as I see them. The plain fact is that war has to be recovered from gradually. A war is not over when the battle flags are furled. When that time has come the war still has to be paid for. We are exactly in the condition of a patient who has endured the racking tortures of a terrific fever for a long period of time and is wasted away.

When the fever ceases it takes months and perhaps years for convalescence and a complete restoration of strength. Mistakes were made in settling the terms of peace. Countries were carved up; Austria was reduced to such small dimensions that, as my distinguished friend from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], I think, mentioned—at any rate, it is well known—she has a city of over 2,000,000 people and a total population, I believe, of only six or eight million. I will ask the Senator the number.

Mr. CARAWAY. Six million.

Mr. REED of Missouri. That impossible condition was imposed and those people are suffering. That is a condition that ought to be righted; but is it our problem? We might tender our good offices. I would make no objection to this country tendering its good offices; but I insist that we did not cut the Austrian Empire into pieces and it is not our business to take the responsibility of putting it together. We can, however, offer our good offices.

The next difficulty is the inflation of the currency of certain countries. The reason it takes thousands of kronen to buy a bed is because the Government was issuing a few billion kronen while a gentleman is taking off his clothes to get into bed. They do not have money at all; they have printing presses and paper. They run the presses night and day and print a lot of stuff they call money. When that paper—

Mr. CARAWAY. May I interrupt the Senator for just a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I will yield to the Senator when I finish the sentence. When that piece of paper, which simply had a printing press run over it, is not accepted by the world or by anybody as an equivalent of gold or as an equivalent of anything, its purchasing power goes to nothing. That is the reason why the people of certain European nations have to pay such enormous prices. Now I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, he has demonstrated the fact that he is the only man in the Senate who knows anything about economic conditions in Europe.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, the Senator ought not to make that remark. I have not said anything unkind about anybody or assumed any superior knowledge.

Mr. CARAWAY. Well, I was just going to say, with all that superior knowledge, will the Senator tell us what the people of

Austria, for instance, are going to do when paper money is the only money they have?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, that is quite another question than the one I am discussing. I am discussing the reasons the currency of certain countries has no value. I am willing to discuss the other question later. But let me say to the Senator I have assumed no superiority of knowledge.

I am offering my views just as he offers his. I do not profess any superiority, but I do claim the right on this floor to submit the facts as I understand them and to submit my views along with the views of other Senators.

Mr. CARAWAY. I hope the Senator will pardon me. I do not wish to be offensive and did not intend to be, but I understood the Senator from Missouri to be lecturing everybody else and deploring the fact that all the statements which had been made were reckless and were not based on facts but merely assumptions of facts.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am merely arguing that some of those statements are assumptions of facts. I have not charged that the Senator from Arkansas has not stated the fact about anything. I will take his word for the value of the bed over there and as to the condition of the currency.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am not curious that the Senator should do that; but if I may interrupt the Senator for just a moment, what impressed me was that, if I understood him correctly, he assumed that everybody who had made statements about economic conditions had made wild and, the Senator said, foolish statements.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, no. The Senator now is illustrating just what I have been arguing. He says that I assumed that everybody who had made a statement had made a foolish statement. I made no such assertion. I have discussed certain particular statements and have sought to show that these particular statements are exaggerated. Whereupon the Senator accuses me of having declared that everybody who made any statements about economic conditions had made foolish statements.

Mr. CARAWAY. I rather think the Senator himself may be illustrating what he is arguing.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Possibly so. I said that some statements, in my judgment, were wild statements, but I did not say that everybody had made wild statements. If the Senator will just notice what I say—

Mr. CARAWAY. I always pay the most particular attention to what the Senator from Missouri says, because it is interesting.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well. Of course, if Austria or Germany or Russia turn their printing presses loose and print bales of stuff which they call money, that will not make it money. So when I am told that it costs a man a million kronen or a million francs or a million of some other kind of money to buy some little article, that does not mean anything except that there is in that country no honest money in circulation. They have not the gold back of it, I suppose, and they have not any credit back of it. If they had credit back of it their money would be of more value, because people would expect it to be redeemed some day.

Why do they not have credit? There are many answers to that question, but it seems to me that one reason Germany has no credit is because she can not get the amount of indemnity which she must pay fixed and can not get any arrangements made to pay it with which she thinks she can comply. Until that is done no banker will loan Germany money; nobody will sell her goods on credit; no nation will loan her money. So we get down to the fact that at the root of the whole situation lies a political problem. Senators may call it economic, but the economic condition is created that it may be used to establish the perpetual dominance of France. I only speak my judgment, for we can not prove these things, but judging by the circumstantial evidence I have no more doubt in my mind that France wishes to stay in Germany, that she proposes to hold the occupied regions forever if she can, than that I am standing on this floor. Hence she does not want to fix the indemnities at a figure which Germany can meet. In that I can not much blame the Frenchman. He views everything from his nation's standpoint. But, viewing the same question from our standpoint and from the standpoint of the world outside of France, I think a great mistake is being made and that an unjustifiable thing is being attempted.

We may call an economic conference here, but until the French nation has gotten into a frame of mind where it is willing to adopt a different policy, I do not know what may be accomplished by such a conference.

When will France get into that position? When she finds that she is being abandoned by the rest of the world in her

attitude and when, perhaps, her own economic condition compels her to adopt a more moderate course. However that may be, so long as the European nations expect the United States to stand by as a Lady Bountiful and put up the money they will continue to insist on everything they can get. Those are not our problems. They do not want us over there for any other purpose except as we may come to contribute to them. They do not want us to be "their keepers."

Again, it has been said "that we might as well understand that the United States is a part of the world." The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] in substance declared: "I solemnly adjure you from that shadowland which I am about to enter and, speaking with the wisdom of the ages, to recognize the fact that the United States is part of the world."

In the name of common sense, who ever doubted we were part of the world? Being a part of the world, however, is a very different thing from setting ourselves up as the boss of the world. Being a citizen in a community with a right to your own home is quite a different thing from undertaking to boss your neighbor and drive him out of his back lot. We have been a part of this world since that glorious day when the farmers rallied along the lanes of Lexington; we were a part of this world before that; but England did not yet know it; she thought we were a part of England. We have been a part of the world down through the century and the half of our existence. We have been the only part of the world that has been able to maintain clear and unspotted its title to be called just. Because we have not tried to overrun the world; because we have not tried to impose our will upon the world; because we have not tried to be a part of the world, in the sense that we undertook to dominate and boss the world; because we have stayed at home and pursued the American policy of attending to our own business and letting the remainder of the world attend to its business—for that reason we occupy the proud position we do to-day, with all the rest of the world saying "Come over and help us." The trouble is we never get through helping them.

Mr. President, out of this turmoil the world will emerge. Somehow or other France and Germany will adjust their difficulties. It may mean another slice from Germany; it may mean a long period of payments; it may mean that other countries over there directly interested will intervene to some extent; but, rest assured of one thing, the world will still be here; humanity will not disappear; the temples of justice will not all be dissolved in ashes; the schools of learning will not vanish in "thin air."

Let us get the blood out of our heads. They have been trying to do some things over there that they ought not to do and they have made some trouble. I think, without any question, England encouraged Greece to war on Turkey; I think, without any question, France came to the aid of Turkey; and I think both of those nations have learned a lesson.

There will be some disturbances, but you can trust the European statesmen to have some sense. We do not possess all of the wisdom. If we can just get out of our heads and hearts the conceited idea that America has a magic wand, and that whatever she touches will turn to gold, and that her statesmen can sit down in conference and solve problems that none of the other statesmen of the world can solve, we will be wiser than we are now.

Mr. President, let America keep out of Europe. Let us tell the European countries that what they owe is a sacred debt and that we expect payment. Let us deal with them as justly and as considerately as we possibly can in regard to times of payment. If a conference is called to consider the rehabilitation of Europe, I have no objection to the United States tendering its good offices.

I do insist, however, that we shall not accept any part of the responsibility for the present conditions of Europe. We did not make it. I do insist that we shall not sit down at any table or engage in any conferences which will bind the United States to send another dollar of money there or to send another man there. Let us stay at home and attend to America. While its condition is not anything like as bad as some people have maintained, it nevertheless is bad enough to need our attention and all the ability we have.

Mr. President, my heart bleeds for those people. I said I was in favor of not sending another dollar over there. I do not mean in that statement to include cases of absolute want and starvation. I would not object to reasonable contributions of that nature but I am opposed to our undertaking to carry their financial loads. It was said here this morning that the French people loaned the French Government the money to carry on this war and that the French Government never will be able to pay them.

Well, that is a question for the French Government and the French people; but, if the statement be true, then who should suffer the loss, the French people who loaned their money to France or the American people who had nothing to do with the transaction? The French people own these debts, and if the country is in such condition it can not pay, the French people will have to reduce or cancel the debts.

There is one thing about this enormous war debt out of which we can get a grain of consolation, along with all the bad that there is in it, and that is that European countries have so much debt on them now that probably that debt itself will prevent any big war in the near future.

Mr. President, in what I have tried to say I have simply sought to point out the fact that there has been constant overstatements of the real situation. No great and appalling catastrophe is going to happen to America. I have every confidence that European statecraft and European business ability will solve the problem over there; but I have this to say: If you are ever to get the world upon its feet financially you must let people go to work successfully, and peoples can not work unless they have markets in which to sell.

I want our State Department to tell us why we are not placed in a position to trade openly and freely with Russia. There are 180,000,000 people there, with a territory several times as large as that of the United States—a great people, though they may have what we regard as a very foolish or bad government. They have always had a very foolish or bad government, and they have a bad one now, but I question whether it is as bad as the Czar's government was. Why is it that we are not making an effort through our State Department to open the doors of Russia to American trade?

Take a map and examine it; look at the picture of Russia and compare it with that of Europe. The rest of Europe in point of territory dwindles almost into insignificance. Why is it that we are stupidly sitting here and letting other nations get the Russian trade? Why do we not do something for our own people and open those doors?

Why is it that Mexico, with only the Rio Grande dividing her from us, is largely cut off from American trade to-day? What kind of stupidity is it that does not open that door? How long does a government have to exist before it can be recognized? What kind of civil-service examination and certificate of character will satisfy the State Department and the President?

Open Mexico to American trade! Let American farm products find a free market there. It is true that some goods are shipped there now; but as long as we do not recognize that country properly, its credit, its ability to get on, are under a severe handicap.

Here, then, are two great countries of the world partially cut off from us. Why do we not help them by recognizing them?

You say you do not like the Russian Government. Well, did you like the government of the Sioux Indian when we traded with him? Did you like the government of the Czar of Russia when he ruled by his Cossacks and his bayonets? Did you like the government that was set up by Belgium in the Congo? And yet we traded with Belgium. The business of the statesmen of this country is to open the doors for trade and commerce, and we will do more for agriculture and labor in that way than we can by all of the resolutions and laws we can pass in this body; but we sit supinely here pursuing a policy which, whether or not it was wise in the first instance, certainly is not wise to-day.

You talk also about helping Europe. I should like to see these people helped, but I want to put this to you: What is the use of shedding tears about the poverty of Germany or Austria, where there are millions of willing hands anxious to work, if while we are shedding tears over their impoverishment we pass a law that in substance and effect declares that we will not buy anything they produce?

Mr. President, I submit this question to the Senator who visited that country and gathered much useful information: If the Austrian people could find a market for their goods at fair prices outside of Austria, does he not think Austria would soon rehabilitate herself? Would not Germany soon improve her fortunes?

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I think myself, to speak of Austria first, that Austria would have to have more than a market for her products.

Mr. REED of Missouri. It would help.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, it would help, of course. That is what would restore us, if we had a market. It would restore any country to a very large extent if it could get a market for its products and get raw materials out of which to work them.

Mr. REED of Missouri. If, however, we had an economic conference, and a German statesman or an Austrian statesman came in and said: "Our people are willing to work, but

you will not let us ship our goods here and give you goods for your money," what would say our friends upon the other side of the Chamber? They would declare: "We can not disturb the tariff."

I understand that other countries have passed laws that are very inimical to trade with Austria. If that is the case, then that is a matter for statesmanship. I think I can speak for this side of the Chamber and say that if our friends on the other side will agree to it we can remove that one difficulty as far as America is concerned, and we can reduce our tariff very promptly, and let them have a market for some of their goods. Is it not a bit of arrant hypocrisy to talk about helping Germany and helping Austria and helping Europe, while we are posting customhouse officials at every port of this country, with instructions to keep out all foreign-made goods unless they pay a prohibitive tax?

It seems to me, Mr. President, that this debate has done some good. I am glad this amendment is withdrawn, and I hope that the State Department and the President at an early day will conclude that if they can not let the Senate or the Congress know what they are doing, lest the information might be misused, they will take the American people into their confidence. If they do not take the American people into their confidence pretty soon, the American people will take care of them in that happy day which is approaching.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I did intend to speak on the Borah amendment; but since it has been withdrawn I shall not occupy any of the time of the Senate other than to say that I think that it was a very unwise and mischievous provision, and if enacted into law I am quite sure that it would have resulted in a great deal of harm not only to this country but to the other countries of the world.

In connection with what I had expected to say I had prepared certain figures that I now ask may go into the Record without reading. They are the domestic exports of agricultural products from the United States during the calendar years 1913, 1921, and 1922 in dollars, and the domestic exports of agricultural products from the United States during those same years in pounds and in bushels, showing the quantities in each of the three years mentioned, namely, 1913, 1921, and 1922.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Domestic exports of agricultural products from the United States during the calendar years 1913, 1921, and 1922.

Commodities.	1913	1921	1922 ¹
Cotton, raw.....	\$575,495,653	\$534,241,795	\$700,000,000
Tobacco, unmanufactured.....	52,937,394	205,133,430	148,000,000
Wheat.....	95,098,838	433,053,336	208,000,000
Wheat flour.....	56,865,444	117,698,225	85,000,000
Corn.....	26,515,146	92,766,988	120,000,000
Other grains and flour.....	24,912,438	104,481,478	112,000,000
Meat products.....	157,486,469	298,213,397	240,000,000
Dairy products.....	3,120,099	44,145,749	25,000,000
Sugar.....	1,873,923	48,826,890	70,000,000
Fruits and nuts.....	33,708,695	70,157,327	80,000,000
Oils.....	21,033,089	28,465,200	15,000,000
Oil cake and meal.....	27,761,624	24,488,651	20,000,000
Vegetables.....	6,837,535	19,451,883	18,000,000
Other agricultural products.....	61,822,290	98,581,040	59,000,000
Total.....	1,145,469,137	2,119,705,359	1,930,000,000

¹ Estimated.

Domestic exports of agricultural products from the United States during the calendar years 1913, 1921, and 1922.

Commodities.	1913	1921	1922 ¹
Cotton, raw.....pounds..	4,481,868,754	3,239,113,489	3,284,000,000
Tobacco, unmanufactured...do...	444,371,661	522,756,026	434,000,000
Wheat.....bushels.....	99,508,968	280,057,601	165,000,000
Wheat flour.....barrels..	12,278,206	16,698,225	15,000,000
Corn.....bushels.....	45,286,759	128,974,505	166,000,000
Other grains and flour...pounds..	1,910,313,874	4,548,633,312	6,247,000,000
Meat products.....do.....	1,317,200,342	1,946,609,640	1,817,000,000
Dairy products.....do.....	26,238,874	318,994,876	214,000,000
Sugar.....do.....	51,772,125	933,792,360	1,840,000,000
Fruits and nuts.....do.....	602,133,509	958,452,019	1,081,000,000
Oils.....do.....	297,270,589	280,105,404	146,000,000
Oil cake and meal.....do.....	1,951,184,003	1,206,084,078	929,000,000
Vegetables.....do.....	190,047,720	502,353,480	470,000,000
Other agricultural products...do....	680,045,190	528,648,370	712,000,000
Total.....do.....	22,890,128,013	42,307,947,957	39,340,000,000

¹ Estimated.

Mr. SMOOT. I also ask that the total values of imports and exports of merchandise into and from the United States by months during 1921 and 1922 be incorporated in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Total values of imports and exports of merchandise into and from the United States, by months, during 1921 and 1922.

Months.	Imports.		Exports.	
	1921	1922	1921	1922
January.....	\$208,796,989	\$217,185,396	\$654,271,423	\$278,848,469
February.....	214,529,680	215,743,282	486,454,090	250,619,841
March.....	251,909,241	256,177,796	386,680,346	329,979,817
April.....	254,579,325	217,023,142	340,464,106	318,469,578
May.....	204,911,186	252,517,254	329,709,579	307,568,828
June.....	185,689,909	200,400,898	336,896,006	335,116,750
July.....	178,159,154	251,772,318	325,181,138	301,250,032
August.....	194,708,751	281,411,705	366,887,538	301,804,618
September.....	179,292,163	228,794,639	324,863,123	313,093,286
October.....	188,907,629	(1)	343,330,815	370,720,154
November.....	210,948,036		294,062,219	383,000,000
December.....	237,495,505		296,198,373	

¹ Imports for the period from Sept. 22 to Oct. 31 under the new tariff act are greatly delayed on account of the great number of defective entries filed with collectors of customs since Sept. 22, which failed to show the information required by the new tariff law and the revised statistical schedule. The compilation of these figures is proceeding very slowly, and according to present information from the customs service it will be the first part of January before they are available.

Mr. SMOOT. In that connection, I desire to call attention to the fact that the Treasury Department has not yet figures of imports for the months of October and November and the balance of December of this year. But I notice that the daily statement of the United States Treasury dated December 26, 1922, shows that the customs receipts collected up to the 26th of this month are \$33,516,176.66, and for the corresponding period of last year they were only \$20,813,316.13, or an increase of a little over 65 per cent for this year. For the fiscal year 1923—that is, beginning July 1, 1922, up to the 26th of this month—the amount collected was \$244,938,120.13, while in the corresponding period of last year the receipts were only \$141,166,526.08. So, whatever may be said of the tariff keeping goods out of the country, the record does not show that to be a fact.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, very little remains to be done on the naval appropriation bill, and I hope Senators will remain for a short time so that we can complete the consideration of the bill, and I can thereby be enabled to move an adjournment until Tuesday. If we do not complete the bill to-night we shall have to sit to-morrow to conclude it.

Mr. HEFLIN obtained the floor.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I wanted to move the adoption of some formal amendments. Mr. President, I ask that we proceed with the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 9 it is proposed to strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive, in the following words:

OFFICE OF NAVAL INTELLIGENCE.

For employees in the Office of Naval Intelligence, \$30,000: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,800 per annum except two persons at \$2,000 each.

[Mr. McKellar addressed the Senate. His speech appears on p. 1105, December 30.]

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just one word in regard to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee. I concur with him in his desire to curtail naval expenditures to the utmost. The attitude of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives in that respect is very well known. It has taken a very pronounced and very strong position toward a very drastic, far-reaching reduction of the Naval Establishment, and the Senate committee reporting this bill accepted the figures as reported by the House committee and as adopted by the House.

The Senator from Tennessee has read in part from a report made by the House committee on the bill, in which reference was made to recommendations which that committee made last year. This year they abandoned those recommendations and accepted the figures which had been established by the House of Representatives itself after a most exhaustive study. In the preparation of the appropriation for the Naval Establishment the year before—for 1922—the same question was gone into very exhaustively in the Senate and in the Senate committee. The Senator is basing his conclusion on a number of general figures, which I think are entirely erroneous, with regard to the comparative size of the personnel of the navies

of Great Britain, Japan, and the United States. The Senator says that the enlisted force of Great Britain is 84,041 men. That is true, so far as the regular navy of Great Britain is concerned, but their navy is upon an entirely different basis from ours. That figure does not include the air force, while the 86,000 men provided for in this bill does include the air force. The entire air force of Great Britain numbers 29,517 men. The entire air force of the Army and Navy of the United States is 13,619 men.

Mr. McKellar. If you add the difference, then there are a great many more enlisted men in the American Navy, relative to its strength, than there are in the British Navy, according to the Senator's own figures.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Under the agreement recently made by the Arms Limitation Conference it was agreed that the Navy of the United States should be maintained upon an equal basis with that of Great Britain.

Mr. McKellar. As to capital ships only.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Capital ships are the unit of naval strength; but the spirit of the treaty was, and the basis upon which the entire agreement was reached was the assumption, at least on our part, of our true naval policy, that the two navies should be of equal strength. As a matter of fact, in the existing establishment the British Navy is very much larger than that of the United States. In the same agreement it was provided that the Japanese Navy, taking capital ships as the unit of naval strength, should be upon a relative basis of 3 to 5. As a matter of fact, the enlisted strength of the Japanese Navy at the present time is 65,469 men, as against 86,000 provided for in this bill. Fifty-one thousand six hundred men would be the relative strength of the Japanese Navy if the two navies were to be maintained upon a ratio of 3 to 5 upon the basis of the pending bill. In other words, the Japanese Navy contains an enlisted strength of 13,867 men above the ratio of 3 to 5 on the basis of the pending bill and our naval strength provided for the current year.

The total enlisted strength of the British Navy, counting their air force, the Australian Naval Force, the New Zealand Navy, the Canadian Navy, the Royal Indian Marines, the Royal Fleet Auxiliary, the navy signaling station, and men on yard craft of the mercantile marine, who are doing the work that is done by enlisted men in our Navy, is 102,934 men, as against the 86,000 men provided for in this bill. In the much more vital matter of trained and educated officers, Japan, instead of being on a basis of 3 to our 5 is practically equal, having 7,705 officers to our 7,707 officers. Great Britain, instead of being on a ratio of 5 to 5, has 9,442 officers to our 7,707.

Mr. President, I want to make another comment upon the figures given by the Senator from Tennessee. He stated that the difference of 19,000 men, as between the number of men provided for in the bill as reported by the committee and the 67,000 who would be provided for under his amendment, would amount to a difference of expense of \$30,000,000. As a matter of fact the entire cost of the maintenance of a seaman is less than I gave the other day. I gave the figures to the Senator the other day as a thousand dollars. Upon a careful examination I find it is even less than that—that the entire cost of the maintenance of a man, including his salary, his clothing, and his provisions, is \$840 a year. So that the entire cost of the maintenance of this number of men, instead of \$30,000,000, would be only a little over half of that, or \$15,960,000.

In view of the very exhaustive examination and exhaustive discussion of this matter which has taken place recently, in which everybody who was interested in the discussion on both sides took part, and in which every argument was marshaled for and against the proposition of the Senator from Tennessee, I do not think it is necessary to go further into it at this time, and I hope the Senate will vote down the amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I would like to inquire of the Senator from Washington whether he desires to proceed further to-night. I dislike to call for a quorum, but I feel constrained on this amendment to ask for a yea-and-nay vote. If the Senator will let it go over until to-morrow or Tuesday, I will not ask for a quorum now.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it be in recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator if he would object to taking an adjournment so that we can have a morning hour to-morrow?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I was in hopes that we could take an adjournment from to-morrow until Tuesday. If we take a recess, it will save some little time and may enable us to do that. On Tuesday the ordinary business that is transacted in the so-called morning hour would come up.

Mr. KING. I do not want to discommode anybody, but—

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection in the world to taking a vote on my amendment this afternoon. The Senator in charge of the bill has been exceedingly kind to me with reference to my necessary absences.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I would be very glad to have a vote upon the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee now.

Mr. KING. I stated to the Senate, and the Senator from Tennessee must have heard me, that I shall ask for a roll call upon his amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I heard the statement, but there is probably no hope of getting a quorum here at this late hour.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I was in hopes that the Senator from Utah would withhold that point of order until we had disposed of the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Utah said he would ask for a yea-and-nay vote on my amendment.

Mr. KING. I said I did not want to call Senators back this afternoon, and I asked the Senator to let the vote upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee go over until to-morrow or until Tuesday.

Mr. LODGE. It will go over until Monday, if we do not finish it to-morrow.

Mr. KING. Of course, Senators on the other side of the aisle have the power, I suppose, to determine when we shall adjourn and the hour to which we shall adjourn.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is much preferable to arrive at some amicable agreement.

Mr. KING. Certainly; and I do not want to ask for a roll call this afternoon.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course the Senator can state his position, but I was under the impression that he had reference to a desire for a yea and nay vote upon the amendment which he gave notice he would offer.

Mr. KING. No; I desire a roll call on the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Then I renew the unanimous-consent request which I made a moment ago, that when the Senate conclude its business to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened; and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, December 30, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 29 (legislative day of December 27), 1922.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Harry C. Whitehill to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt.

POSTMASTER.

TENNESSEE.

Blanton W. Burford, Lebanon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, December 29, 1922.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Every good thing in all the world, blessed Lord, is but a single ray of Thy light. We bless Thee that Thou art the rock of our salvation, the foundation of all heavenly vision, and shepherd of all Thy earthly children. Always enable us to be useful as true friends and helpful as wise advisers in public and private councils. When silence means the pause of disappointment; when plans are overthrown; when energies are misdirected and end in the defeat of our best wisdom, then, our heavenly Father, take us by the hand, light and lead the way, and give the heart the blessing of repose. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes on a matter of procedure.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes on a matter of procedure. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, we hope to conclude the bill now under consideration to-day and to complete the Post Office appropriation Tuesday. It is possible we will not get through with the Post Office appropriation bill on Tuesday. I want to give the House abundant opportunity for proper consideration of that measure, but on Wednesday, under the agreement that has been entered into or the understanding that has been had, we vote on the Agricultural bill, the Interior Department bill, and the Post Office appropriation bill, if it is ready, and complete the consideration of the Post Office bill if we have not completed consideration up to that time. I now ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Saturday it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Saturday it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business on Wednesday next. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish the gentleman would defer that request until Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee returns. He can ask unanimous consent on Tuesday.

Mr. MONDELL. On both of these matters I had an understanding with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] before he left; otherwise I would have discussed the matter with the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

REFERENCE OF A BILL.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I request that the bill H. R. 13552, a bill to extend the provisions of the Federal highway act to Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on the Territories, be transferred to the Committee on Roads. I had the consent of the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Committee on the Territories, and the ranking member of the Committee on Roads, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL], also consents.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alaska asks unanimous consent that the bill referred to be transferred from the Committee on the Territories to the Committee on Roads. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13559, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13559, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13559) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the item on page 21, line 15. In this connection I will state that request is made simply that the committee may fully keep faith with a Member of the House. Unintentionally the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] was misinformed as to the bill by the subcommittee, and so to keep perfect faith with him I ask to return to that item.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that at the close of yesterday afternoon, immediately after reading the last paragraph, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY] had an amendment he desired to offer. This would not interfere with his amendment?